L.15.23

THE GRAND IMPOSTOR DISCOVERED:

OR, AN Historical DISPUTE of the Papacy and Popish Religion:

A A0. d.4

1. Demonstrating the newness of both; 2. By what artifices they are maintained? 3. The contradictions of the Roman Doctors in defending them: Divided in four Parts, 1. Of Bishops; 2. Of Arch-bishops; 3. Of an œcumenick Bishop; 4. Of Antichrist.

PART I.

Divided in two Books; In the first is examined, 1. if *Peter* by divine Institution was Monarch of the Church? 2. If at the command of Christ he was Bishop of *Rome*? In the second is examined, if the Bishop of *Rome* was acknowledged Successor to *Peter* in the Monarchy of the Church, before the death of *Cyprian*, or *anno*, 260?

The Negatives of which three Questions are made out, by unanswerable monuments of Antiquity, and all what is pretended for their affirmatives, is proved to be either wrested, falsly translated, mutilated or forged.

Cicero, lib. 2. de Orator.

Fieri potest ut quod dixit iratus dixerit. Silus *annuit, tum* Crassus, *fieri potest ut quod dixit non intelligeres: hic quoque* Silus *fassus est, tum* Crassus, *fieri potest ut non omnino audieris quod te audisse dicis.* Silus *tacuit, omnes riserunt.*

By *S. Colvill*

Edinburgh, Printed by His Majesties Printers, for the Author, *Anno Dom.* 1673.

EX BIBL. UNIV. EDINBURGEN.

UNIV. EDINBURGEN. BIBLIOTHECA REGIA

TO

HIS GRACE

The Duke of

LAUDERDALE,

Marqueſs of Marche, *Earl of* Lauderdail, *Viſcount* Maitland, *Lord* Thirleſtane, Muſſelburgh, *and* Bolton, *Knight of the moſt Noble* Order *of the* Garter, *His* Majeſties *High* Commiſſioner, Preſident *of His* Council, *and Sole* Secretary *of* State *in His* Kingdom *of* Scotland.

May it pleaſe your Grace,

THat the *Chriſtian Faith* (as it was taught by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, and confirmed by the four firſt *General Councils*) is eſtabliſhed by His *Majeſties* authority; all have reaſon to be thankful both to *God*, and to His *Majeſty*.

While we are contending for things of leſſer moment at home, *Religion* is dangerouſly aſſaulted from abroad; their *artifices* are ſubtile, their *ſucceſs* is lamented.

By what perſwaſions they endeavour to gain *Proſelyts*; and how they are refuted? *Your Grace* will find affirmed in the *Preface*, and proved in the *Diſput* following. The firſt part whereof I preſent to *your Grace*, it being difficult for me to publiſh it all at once.

My Lord, ſome perhaps, as their motive of ſuch an addreſs as this, would fall a painting out the *praiſes of your Grace*, and *your Anceſtors in your Face*; as, that one or other of *your Race*, could be no more ſpared from the *State* in every age, then one of the *Æacides* from the warrs of *Greece*: which although moſt true, yet I forbear, leſt I ſhould offer violence, *vim facere*, *to your Graces Modeſty*, by unſeaſonable mentioning things which all know to be undenyable.

Never-

Nevertheleſs, I hope *your Grace* will pardon me if I affirm, that it is a main encouragement of my troubling *you*, that *your Grace* is a *Gentle-man of Spirit*, verſed in *Antiquity*, and able to diſcern if I perform any thing to the purpoſe, in this great *ſubject*, or *proceſs* of greateſt *importance*, that ever depended before the Tribunal of Heaven.

My Lord, I have likewiſe *privat obligations* to *your Grace*. I had the honour to be *your Condiſciple*, at which time it did not obſcurely appear, what *your Grace* would prove afterwards? Alſo having preſented ſeveral *Trifles* to *your Grace*, at *your* two times being in *Scotland*, *you* ſeemed to accept of them, with a favourable countenance: which encouraged me to trouble *your Grace afreſh*. *A Spaniel, the more he is taken notice of, the more he troubles his Benefactors, with importunat kindneſs.*

Taking

Taking all for good *coyn*, whether they be in jeſt or in earneſt.

If I perform any thing in this great *ſubject* worthy of *your Graces peruſal*, I would be infinitly proud of it: otherwiſe, the greateſt cenſure I expect from *your Grace*, is, that either *your Grace* would ſmile at my folly, or elſe put me back with a *gentle frown*; hoping *your Grace*, will pardon *preſumption*, proceeding from *ſimplicity* and *good-will*.

I will trouble *your Grace* no more, but being ſorry, that I can give no greater evidence of my propenſion, to *your Graces ſervice*, I reſt as I am able, moſt addicted to it.

Samuel Colvill.

THE PREFACE, DIRECTED TO The Nobility, Gentry, and Burroughs of the Kingdom of *Scotland.*

My Lords and Gentlemen,

SInce I have contrived the following Diſcourſe, chiefly for your uſe, (not preſuming to inform thoſe of the Clergy, it being their Profeſſion; and therefore, having opportunity at will, to go to the woods to gather Strawberries themſelves: whereas your Lordſhips leiſure, by reaſon of your other weighty Employments, requires rather to have them preſented in a diſh) Curioſity perhaps will move one or other of you to peruſe it: Which that you may do the more commodiouſly, it is requiſite that your minds be prepared, by conſidering, 1. What the Subject is I preſent unto your protection? 2. What I perform in it? 3. What is my ſcope and intention? 4. How I anſwer, as I can, to all which is objected againſt me? I am not very eloquent, eſpecially in the Engliſh Tongue (not being much accuſtomed to read Books in that Language) The Diſcourſe for the moſt part, is dogmatick, *and therefore Rhetorick is more hurtful than profitable: If I be underſtood, it is ſufficient, in repreſenting ſhortly, what others have done prolixly; perſpicuouſly, what others have obſcurely: And yet fully, that is, omitting no-*

thing of moment which is pretended by either Party, in that great Controverſie, of the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome.*

And firſt for the Subject; None are ignorant, in what high eſtimation ſearching of Antiquity *is amongſt thoſe, whoſe mindes are erected above the ordinar of men? That religious enquiries of that kind, ought to be preferred to any others, who believe the immortality of the ſoul, none will deny. Among thoſe again, that one Controverſie* of the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome, deſervedly challengeth the firſt place: I preſenting to your Lordſhips in it, the minute of a Proceſs (if not marred by me) the moſt* noble, *the moſt* profitable, *and the moſt* pleaſant, *which hath hitherto depended before the Tribunal of Heaven. That I affirm no Paradoxes, appears by what followeth.*

The Nobility of this queſtion is celebrated by the Learned of both ſides; Eſt Nobilis inter primas Diſputatio, *the nobleſt of Diſputes, ſaith* Chamier: Eſt quæſtio prima, & familiam ducens, A prime and leading queſtion, *ſaith* Salmaſius: *That is, upon it depends all the Controverſies we have with the Church of* Rome. Bellarmine *goeth higher, calling it a debate* de ſumma rei Chriſtianæ; *That is,* Whether the Chriſtian Religion can ſubſiſt or not? *For, in his opinion,* Who calls in queſtion the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome,* he queſtions the truth of the Chriſtian Religion it ſelf.

By which expreſſion of this Jeſuit, appears the immenſe utility of that Controverſie. If any want ability, if they have not leiſure to wade thorow that profound Ocean of Antiquity, to be informed of the truth of that Article, added to the Creed by the Council at Trent, *viz.* That Communion with the Church of *Rome* in all her Tenets, is abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation: *Let them ſtudy this one Controverſie,* of the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome, and it will reſolve the queſtion: for, if it be founded upon* Scripture *and* Antiquity, *without all queſtion,* Communion with the Church of *Rome* is neceſſar unto ſalvation.

tion, and the Religion of Proteſtants, is a new ſprung up hereſie; *ſince the Biſhop of* Rome, in Cathedra, *(and conſequently in their opinion infallible) pronounceth ſo. On the contrary, if the Supremacy of the Biſhop of* Rome *be a thing unknown to Scripture and Antiqnity, it is as certain*, that the Faith of the Modern Roman Church, is a new deviſed cheat and idolatry. *That this followeth of neceſſity, appears by the confeſſion of* Bellarmine *himſelf, in two expreſſions in the preface of thoſe Books of his*, de pontifice Romano: *The firſt we now mentioned, in which he calls that Controverſie of the Popes ſupremacy*, a Debite de ſumma rei Chriſtianæ, *That is*, whether the Chriſtian Religion can ſubſiſt or not? *By* Chriſtian Religion, *no queſtion, he means*, the Faith of the modern Church of *Rome; and conſequently he grants, that they who call in queſtion* the Popes ſupremacy, *they queſtion alſo, the whole body of the Popiſh Religion: And conſequently ſtill he muſt of neceſſity grant, that if the* Popes ſupremacy *be deſtitute of* Scripture *and* Antiquity, *the faith of the Modern Church of* Rome *falls with it, and proves* a new deviſed fiction. *His ſecond expreſſion is, in thoſe ſimilitudes he uſeth, to illuſtrat his aſſertion*, viz. *He compares Religion, without the Popes ſupremacy (which in his opinion, is that of the Modern Church of* Rome) to a Houſe without a Foundation, a Body without a Head, Moon-ſhine, without the Sun: *And ſince it is notorious, that a houſe without a Foundation cannot ſtand, that a Body without a Head cannot live, that the Moon without light of the Sun, muſt be obſcured; He muſt of neceſsity grant, that the Supremacy of the Biſhop of* Rome, *being refuted by Scripture and Antiquity, the Faith and Religion of the Modern Church of* Rome, *is warrantable by neither; and conſequently, proves* a new deviſed idolatrous cheat.

Thirdly, its a moſt pleaſant conteſt; what can be more pleaſing, then to conſider the cauſes of any prodigious Monſter? *how it ſubſiſts? and how it is deſtroyed? how any illuſtrious cheat is contrived?*

contrived? how it is maintained? and how it is diſcovered? But ſuch a Monſter, *ſuch a* Cheat *as the* Biſhop of *Rome, none free of prejudice can behold without admiration. The whole world ſees a perſon, now ignorant, then flagitious, not ſeldome both, put by two or three Italians* of the ſame mettal, *in the Chair of* Rome: *which Preferment he obtains, ſometimes by* blood, *ſometimes by* ſimonie, *ſometimes by* unlawful ſtipulations, *as* to protect Hereſie, and to oppreſs the Catholick Faith; *not ſeldome* by a paction with the Devil (*all which wayes of obtaining the Chair of* Rome, *are confeſſed by Popiſh Writers, ſuch as* Platina *and* Baronius, *as ſhall be proved in the following Diſpute*) *Which* Homuncio *is no ſooner inſtalled, then he is metamorphoſed to be* direct Monarch of the whole World, both in Spirituals and Temporals. *And firſt for* Temporals, *it ſhall be proved in the following Diſpute, that he aſſumes to himſelf in his Bulls,* power of transferring Kingdoms at his pleaſure, of ſtirring up Subjects to Armes againſt their natural Princes, under the pain of Excommunication. *It ſhall be proved, that he makes Emperours and Kings lye proſtrate till he* trade upon their neck; *makes them ſtand* bare-footed, *with their Wives and Children, in froſt and ſnow,* dancing attendants at his Gates, *and yet not not admitted entrance. It ſhall be proved, that he makes Laws, (in that Book entituled,* Sacred Ceremonies) that Emperors and Kings ſhould hold his Stirrup, hold water to his Hands, ſerve diſhes at his Table, carry him on their ſhoulders: *Yea it ſhall be proved, that it is the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, That all Kings are not only the Popes Vaſſals, *but which is more, he is not oblieged by any mutual contract, to ſuffer them to poſſeſs their Kingdoms, but during his pleaſure; that is, he may lawfully depoſe them, although they miſcarry not in the leaſt: In which he doth them no wrong, becauſe they hold their Kingdoms of him,* not as Vaſſals, *but as* depoſitars; *as when any gives to another* his Cloak to keep, *when he re-demands it, he doth him no wrong.* *As*

As for his power, which he assumes to himself in Spirituals, it cannot be repeated without horrour. It shall be proved in the following Dispute, that it is the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, *partly in the* Canon Law, *partly in* the Bulls of Popes themselves, *partly in* Books printed by the Popes Authority, and affirmed by his Visitors to contain nothing contrary to the Catholick Faith; *That the Pope has power* to coyn Articles of Faith at his pleasure, oblieging the whole Church, under the pain of damnation, although he command vice, and forbid vertue. *Secondly, although he should lead all the world to hell with him, yet none should presume to disobey him. Thirdly, that he gives pardon for sin* for money; *and not only of sins by-past, but also of those* to come: *that is, for a little money, he will give you pardon for a little time; but for a round sum, he will give you pardon so long as you please. Fourthly, it shall be proved, that for money,* he permits men to sin; *that is, permits* Clergymen to keep Whoores: *And if any* keep not a Whoor, *he makes them pay for it in some places of* Italy *nevertheless*, because they have liberty to keep a Whoor, if they please. Cornelius Agrippa *affirms, he heard such expressions as these following, in the Popes Court*, Habeat aut non habeat Meretricem, Aureum solvat, quia habet si velit: *That is*, Whether a Priest keep a Whoor or not, let him pay the Tribute, since he may keep one if he please, for such a peece of money. *Fifthly, he makes his* decretal Epistles of equal authority with the Scripture. *Lastly, as he intended* a gigantomachy, *he is called in the* Canon Law, *revised and authorised by* Gregory, 13. Our Lord God the Pope. *It is affirmed in the said Law,* that he has power to make injustice justice, *and contra* that he has power to command the Angels to carry souls to Heaven at his pleasure; *that he has power* to give liberty to men to place the departed Souls of their friends in paradise for money: *that by vertue of his succession to* Peter, *he is assumed* to the society

of

of the individual Trinity; *he not only* hears patiently, *but also* rewards flatterers, *when* their blasphemous Pamphlets *prefer him to Christ*; *as appears in* Innocent 10. *which passage shall be realated* part 1. lib. 1. cap. 11. *of this following Treatise.*

My Lords and Gentlemen, *any would think these horrible passages incredible, but have patience till ye hear them proved, partly by the Canon Law, partly by the* decretals of Popes, *partly by Books authorized by the Popes authority, partly* per res judicatas, or sentences passed in the Popes Court at *Rome. Ignorants of antiquity, (of which our adversaries bragg so much) believe that the Bishop of* Rome *had such immense and unlimitated power, in all Ages, by reason* of his succession to *Peter* in the Monarchy of the Church: *What can be more pleasing, then to consider, from what small beginnings? at what times? upon what occasions? by what steps? by what artifices he mounted to such* a prodigious hight? *and by what practises he maintains himself in it? all which is to the life delineated, in this following Dispute, and proved by uncorrupted and unanswerable testimonies of the Ancients: In which also it will appear, that all what our adversary pretends from antiquity, to maintain the Popes Kingdom, is either sophistically preverted, falsly translated or cited, mutilated or forged.*

My Lords and Gentlemen, *Whereas they make the* Bishoprick of *Peter* the only *basis* and foundation of the Popes power, *in the first place, ye will find, that the Monarchy of* Peter *was never dreamed of,* by the Ancients of the first sixth Centuries. *As for his particular* Bishoprick of *Rome, although some of the Fathers affirm* he was Bishop of *Rome, yet your Lordships will find it proved, that they call* Paul Bishop of *Rome* in the same sense; *and consequently they take the word* Bishop *in a large sense, as it comprehends an* Apostle, *and not* properly, *for a* Bishop tyed to any particular Congregation. *That this is their meaning,*

will

will be proved by two invincible reaſons; the firſt is, becauſe theſe ſame Fathers, in their Catalogues of the Biſhops of Rome, *do not reckon* Peter *in that number, making* Linus *the firſt Biſhop of* Rome, Cletus *the ſecond,* Clement *the third,* &c. *But if they had believed* Peter was Biſhop of *Rome, they would have called him* the firſt Biſhop, *Linus* the ſecond, *Cletus* the third, *Clement* the fourth, *&c. The ſecond reaſon is, That it ſhall be proved by the teſtimonies of thoſe very men, who call* Peter Biſhop of *Rome, That firſt* Linus, *and then* Cletus, *were Biſhops of* Rome *during the* life of Peter: *whereby it is evident, that* Peter *was never properly* Biſhop of Rome, *but was called* Biſhop of Rome *by thoſe Fathers, becauſe he founded the Church of* Rome joyntly with Paul.

In the next place, your Lordſhips will find it proved, albeit many of the Ancients unanimouſly affirmed, that *Peter* was at *Rome,* and founded the Church of *Rome; yet, they were deceived, or elſe the Scripture affirms falſly; ſince it ſhall be proved by Scripture, that* Peter *was elſewhere in that time, in which they affirm he was at* Rome: *yea, it ſhall be proved by unanſwerable reaſons from Scripture, that* Peter *was never at* Rome, *and that all thoſe Fathers who believe he was at* Rome, *were deceived by the teſtimony of one* Papias, *deſcribed by* Euſebius to be a man of no ſpirit, the Author of many fabulous Traditions, and of the hereſie of the Millenarii; *That is, of thoſe maintaining,* that Chriſt before the laſt day, ſhall reign a thouſand years with his Saints.

In the third place, your Lordſhips will find, that the Biſhops of Rome, *before the dayes of* Cyprian, *were poor, perſecuted, pious Martyrs; only two condemned by the whole Church,* ſtrove to advance that myſtery of iniquity (*which* Paul *affirmed was working in his own time)* viz. *Victor* uſurping authority over the Biſhops of the Eaſt, *anno,* 195. and *Stephanus* over the Biſhops of *Africa* and *Spain,* anno 250. or thereabouts *Some*

Doctors of the Church of Rome, *pretends ſeveral monuments of Antiquity, to prove the Supremacy of the Biſhop of* Rome in that interval: *but they ſhall be proved forged, not only by* unanſwerable reaſons, *but alſo by the confeſſions of the moſt learned Doctors of the Church of* Rome, *yea of Popes themſelves, ſuch as* Æneas Silvius, *or* Pius 2.

In the fourth place, your Lordſhips will find the Biſhops of Rome *made rich, by the liberality of* Conſtantine *the Emperor and others; which occaſioned* pride and luxury, *the Parents of* Antichriſt.

In the fifth place, your Lordſhips will find the conception of this Monſter, growing as an Embrio *by degrees in his Mothers belly; the firſt quarter* a Biſhop, *the ſecond* a Metropolitan, *the third* a Patriarch, *between the times of* Cyprian, *and* anno, 604. *In which interval, as the riches of the Biſhop of* Rome *increaſed, ſo pride and corruptions of life grew up with them, and alſo ſome corruption in Doctrine: againſt which, not only* Cyprian, Hieronymus, Sulpitius, Severus, Nazianzenus, Baſilius Magnus, *and other Chriſtian Fathers exclaimed, but alſo* Ammianus Marcellinus, *in the opinion of* Barronius *a Pagan. In that interval,* Damaſus *mounted to the Chair of* Rome *by blood; of which, the ſaid* Ammianus Marcellinus *ſpeaking, after he had related the murthers that were committed, he concludes,* It was not to be admired they aimed at the Chair of *Rome* by ſuch practices, ſince having obtained it, they were enriched by the Gifts of Matrons and other wayes, equalling any King in their port of Table, Cloaths, Houſhold-ſtuff, Attendance and Coatches, or Chariots. *In that interval alſo,* Vigilius *Biſhop of* Rome *(as is related by* Liberatus, *and confeſſed by* Barronius) *obtained the Chair of* Rome *by promiſing to the Empreſs* Theodora, *to abrogat the Council of* Chalcedon, *to eſtabliſh the* Eutichian *hereſie in the Church (which he endeavoured to do, as appears by his Letters, when he was Biſhop of* Rome, *written to ſeveral Courtiers*

tiers, in which he approved that hereſie) And likewayes, by promiſing Gold to Beleſarius, *General to the Emperour* Juſtinian, *in* Italy: *By which practices of* Vigilius, Silverius, *a pious worthy Biſhop of* Rome, *(to make way for the ſaid* Vigilius) *was baniſhed and murthered; and yet the ſaid* Vigilius *was a great ingeminator of* tu es Petrus, *and of* the infallibility of the Biſhop of *Rome. And yet* Barronius *is not aſhamed, againſt all the Writers of that time, to praiſe this Monſter as a Saint; and yet (which is admirable) he confeſſeth the way of his entry to the Biſhoprick of* Rome, *viz.* by diſplacing a pious Biſhop, he obtained the Chair by Simonie, and promiſing to abrogat the Council of *Chalcedon*, and to eſtabliſh the *Eutichian* hereſie. *And this much of the conception of this Monſter.*

In the ſixth place, ye have his birth under Phocas, *who by an Edict, chriſtened him* univerſal Biſhop: *In which, three things are obſervable,* 1 *The God-father;* 2. *The God-bairn Gift;* 3. *The reaſons wherefore it was given* Phocas.

The God-father was the Emperour Phocas, *deſcribed by all Hiſtorians, to be a Monſter for a man; who being a Centurion, or Captain of a Foot-company, raiſed a mutiny in the Army againſt the good Emperour* Mauritius, *and obtained the Empire himſelf by murthering his Maſter, his Empreſs, his Children and his Friends, noted by Hiſtorians to have been a perfidious, perjured, luxurious, cruel Monſter: and yet, he was the firſt Emperour who made the Biſhop of* Rome œcumenick *or* univerſal Biſhop. *And this much of the God-father of that Monſter, which is all the* Jus Divinum *the Biſhops of* Rome *have for their Monarchy in the Church.*

The next thing obſervable, is the God-bairn gift, *or the title of* Univerſal Biſhop, conferred *by* Phocas *upon* Boneſacius *third Biſhop of* Rome, *in the beginning of the ſeventh Age, or about* anno, 604. *If your Lordſhips aſk what ſort of Title and Office it is?* Gregorius Magnus, *Biſhop of* Rome

(*who died not two years before* Bonifacius 3*d was Biſhop of* Rome, *who was firſt made univerſal Biſhop by* Phocas) *And* Pelagius *ſecond Biſhop of* Rome, (*to hom immediatly* Gregorius Magnus *ſucceeded*) *will inform your Lordſhips*, viz. *That the Title, and Office of univerſal Biſhop, were* new, not heard of before that time, Scelerate, Prophane, Sacrilegious, Blaſphemous againſt the Mandates of Chriſt, Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles, Canons and Liberties of the Church. Who ever took upon him, that Office or Title, He contaminated thoſe very times in which he lived, was that Man of Sin, ſitting in the Temple of God, exalting himſelf above all that are called God; (*So* Pelagius, *in an Epiſtle to a Council at* Conſtantinople) that he was like the Devil, exalting himſelf above the other Angels, and equalling himſelf to God; (*So* Gregorius) *which expreſſions, of* Pelagius *and* Gregorius, *and many others, (too prolix to be inſerted here) are found word for word in their Epiſtles: Thoſe Teſtimonies at length, ye will find in the ſecond* Book *of the ſecond Part, of this following Treatiſe.*

The third thing obſerveable by your Lordſhips is, the reaſons wherefore the Emperour Phocas *beſtowed that Title of* œcumenick Biſhop *upon* Bonifacius *third? They are mentioned by* Barronius, ad annum, 604. *and others alſo, as* Sabellicus *and* Platina, *there is not one word of* Tu es Petrus, *or of the* Biſhop *of* Romes *ſucceſſion to* Peter *amongſt them all; They were all civil reſpects; As firſt, becauſe the Emperour had his Title from* Rome, *and ſince* Rome *was the old Imperial City, It was reaſon that the* Biſhop *of* Rome *ſhould have juriſdiction over all* Biſhops. *This is the onely reaſon, mentioned in the Edict of* Phocas; *Others add there reaſons, One of which is this;* Mauritius *the Emperour, murthered by* Phocas, *had beſtowed the title of* univerſal Biſhop *upon* John, *called* Jejunator, *Or* the Faſter *Patriarch of* Conſtantinople: Pelagi-

us

us *and* Gregory *Biſhops of* Rome, *thunder both againſt the Title, and the Function, as we now mentioned, but to no purpoſe:* John *ſtill poſſeſſeth both the Title and the Office. In both which,* Cyriacus *Patriarch of* Conſtantinople *ſucceeds, which* Cyriacus, *protected the Empreſs, and Children of* Mauritius, *againſt* Phocas; *for which reaſon,* Phocas *takes both the Title and the Office from* Cyriacus, *and beſtowed them upon* Bonifacius *third,* Biſhop *of* Rome, *his old friend, as is confeſſed by* Barronius. *Others add two other reaſons, the firſt is this,* Phocas *having obtained the Empyre, by murthering his Maſter* Mauritius, *and all his race, domineered with ſuch tyrrany, that he was abhorred of all: fearing a revolt in the Weſt, to curry favour with* Bonifacius *third Biſhop of* Rome (*whoſe authority was very great in it*) *he beſtowed the title of* univerſal Biſhop *upon him, that by his moyen, he might be eſtabliſhed in his Empyre, and acknowledged by the Romans: The ſecond reaſon related by ſome is, that the ſaid* Bonifacius, *either gave, or did promiſe to give, to* Phocas, *a hudge maſs of Money, and ſo bought the Office from him. However, whatever were the reaſons which moved* Phocas, *it is moſt certain, that the Edict, or Gift of* Phocas *is the oldeſt Evident and Charter that the Biſhop of* Rome *can produce, to inſtruct his Monarchy in the Church; which will more clearly appear, by what followeth.*

Seventhly, your Lordſhips will find, that new born Monſter, Chriſtned univerſal Biſhop, *by the Edict of* Phocas; *ſhunned every where, in the Eaſt, in* Spain, *in* Britain, *in* Germany, *in* France, *yea in* Italy *it ſelf, under the walls of* Rome, *the whole Church, refuſing to obey the Edict of* Phocas, *or to acknowledge the Biſhop of* Rome *univerſal* Biſhop: *One only Paraſite excepted, the* Biſhop *of* Cyprus; *who ſaluted him by that name, out of envy to the Biſhop of* Conſtantinople: *So that in the end, (as it was recorded by ſome) the*

Biſhop

Biſhop of Rome *for very ſhame, gave over that Title of* univerſal Biſhop. *The poſterior Emperoures alſo recalled that Edict of* Phocas, *as appears by the 36th. Canon of the ſixth general Council, called* Trullanum, *convocated by* Pogonatus, *Emperour of* Conſtantinople, *anno*, 680. *By which 36th. Canon of the ſaid Council, was confirmed the 28th. Canon of the Council of* Chalcedon, *celebrated* anno, 450. *By which, the Biſhop of* Conſtantinople, *was made equal to the Biſhop of* Rome, *in Eccleſiaſtick Juriſdiction.*

In the Eighth place, your Lordſhips will find, in the decay of the Grecian Empyre (by the Inundations of barbarous Nations, all enemies to the Empyre, and each of them enemies to one another) that the Biſhops of Rome, *in theſe vicisſitudes, ſided ever with the Conquerour, being alſo courted by them, to countenance them in the eſtabliſhment of their new and unſettled conqueſts: By which practices, that* Apocalyptick *Monſter, (almoſt blaſted in the Budd, and ſtrangled in the Craddle) revived again, not only re-aſſuming the Title of* univerſal Biſhop, *beſtowed on him by* Phocas; *But alſo, ſoaring higher, taking upon him to excomunicate the Grecian Emperour, to ſtir up the Longobards, to bereave him of his poſſeſſions in* Italy, *To deſtroy the Exharchat of* Ravenna, *To bereave him of the* Dutchy *of* Rome, *which the* Pope *got to his own ſhare: And when the Longobards demanded Tribute of him, for the ſaid* Dutchy *of* Rome, (*which the* Biſhops *of* Rome *were acuſtomed to pay to the Grecian* Emperours) *Then he called in the* French, *by whoſe means he deſtroyed the Kingdom of the Longobards; and to requite the* French *Services, he made* Pipin *their General, King of* France, (*ſhutting up the righteous King in a Monaſtery*) *And alſo, in contempt of the Grecian* Emperour, *he made* Carolus Magnus, (*Son of the ſaid* Pipin) *Emperour of the Weſt: Since which time, the Empyre of the Weſt has been divided from that of the Eaſt, until this day: That is, ſince the latter end, of the Eighth Age or Century.*

In

In the ninth place, your Lordſhips will find a ſtrange Cataſtrophy: The Doctors of the Church of Rome *brag much of the ſubmiſſive obedience of* Carolus Magnus *to the power of the Biſhop of* Rome; *which in effect he ſeemed to do at firſt, untill he obtained his ends: but having accompliſhed his intentions, he made it appear to poſterity, that both the* ſpiritual *and* temporal juriſdiction of the Biſhop of *Rome*, was a Sword in a mad mans hand: *he curbed him ſo, both in* ſpirituals *and* temporals, *that he left him no more, but the bare Title of* univerſal Biſhop, *but as to the power of it, he made him a meer cypher, as appears by what follows. The Hiſtory is very pleaſant, but much depraved by the Popiſh Authors ſuch as* Barronius *and others: but if your Lordſhips will believe thoſe Hiſtorians, (who lived in the time of* Carolus Magnus, *or the times next following, who queſtionleſs are better to be believed then* Barronius, *or any other late Popiſh Writer, known to be abominable depravers of Antiquity by unanſwerable Arguments, as ſhall be proved in the following Treatiſe) The ſtory is this, and two-fold; In the firſt is related, what little reſpect* Carolus Magnus *had to the* ſpiritual authority *of the Biſhop of* Rome, *and is this:*

The quarrel of the Biſhop of Rome *againſt the Grecian Emperor of* Conſtantinople, *was for* Images, *or* Image-worſhip: *Two Emperours of* Conſtantinople, Leo, Iſaurus *and* Copronymus *his ſon, had procured* Image-worſhip *to be declared* Idolatry, *in the ſeventh general Council of* Conſtantinople, anno, 760, *conſiſting of* 338 *Biſhops.*

Stephanus *Biſhop of* Rome *procures of* Irene (*Daughter-in-law to* Copronymus, *Widow of* Leo 4. *his Son, and Queen-regent of the Eaſtern Empire, during the minority of her Son* Conſtantinus 7*th.*) *the ſecond Council of* Neice, *which Council declared the* 7*th. general Council of* Conſtantinople *hereticall, and eſtabliſhed* Image-worſhip; *which Decree of the ſecond Council of* Neice, *was confirmed and renewed by ſeveral Pro-*

vincial

vincial Councils in Italy, *under ſeveral Biſhops of* Rome. Carolus Magnus *calls a Council at* Franckford, anno, 794. *in which were preſent moſt of the Biſhops of the Weſt, in number* 300. *at which Council were alſo preſent the Legats of* Hadrianus primus *Biſhop of* Rome, *to ſolicite the Council to eſtabliſh* Image-worſhip, *to condemn* the 7th. general Council of *Conſtantinople*, as heretical; *to confirm* the 2d. Council of *Neice* as Orthodox, *and likewayes* thoſe Provincial Councils of *Italy*, which had eſtabliſhed Image-worſhip. *The Council of* Franckford (*in which* Carolus Magnus *preſided*) *was ſo far from obeying the commands of* Hadrianus *Biſhop of* Rome, *that on the contrary it confirmed* the 7th. general Council of *Conſtantinople* as Orthodox, *condemned* the 2d. Council of *Neice*, three or four Provincial Councils in *Italy*, and three or four Biſhops of *Rome* (*and amongſt them*, Hadrianus primus *himſelf*) as impious, heretical Idolaters, becauſe they eſtabliſhed Image-worſhip. *And after the Council was diſſolved, a Book was written at the command of* Carolus Magnus, (*which Book is yet preſerved in ſeveral Bibliothecks*) *in which at length was declared, by what ſophiſtry, perverting of Scripture*, Image-worſhip *was eſtabliſhed by the ſaid* 2d. *Council of* Nice, *and thoſe other Provincial Councils of* Italy. *Here your Lordſhips may obſerve, what regard* Carolus Magnus *had to the ſpiritual Authority of the Biſhop of* Rome, *who exauctorated the Emperors of* Conſtantinople, *for procuring* Image-worſhip *to be declared* Idolatry, *and renting from them the Empire of the Weſt, conferred it upon the ſaid* Carolus Magnus: *and yet, the ſaid* Carolus Magnus, *in a Council at* Franckford, *procures the ſaid Emperor in the Eaſt to be declared* Orthodox, *in aboliſhing* Image worſhip, *and condemns thoſe very Biſhops of* Rome, *as hereticks, who had depoſed the Emperours of* Conſtantinople, *for that reaſon; and who, for that reaſon, had given unto himſelf the Empyre of the Weſt: whereby it appears, that although he ſeemed pliable to the Biſhop*

ſhop of Romes *juriſdiction, to obtain his own ends, yet having obtained them, he cared not much for him.*

If Carolus Magnus *acknowledged not the infallibility of the Biſhop of* Rome *in ſpirituals, he regarded his temporal juriſdiction far leſs. We told before, that the reaſon wherefore the Biſhop of* Rome *called in the French againſt the Lombards, was, becauſe they demanded Tribute of him, for the Territories about* Rome; *their Title was* conqueſt, *they had conquered theſe Lands from the Grecian Emperors: And ſince the Biſhop of* Rome *was ever accuſtomed to pay Tribute for thoſe Lands unto the Grecian Emperor, it was reaſonable, that themſelves having conquered the Lands, ſhould alſo have the Tribute. Whereupon the Biſhop of* Rome *calls in the French to* Italy, *to aſſiſt him againſt the Lombards: And firſt,* Carolus Martellus *leads an Army into* Italy, *in favour of the Biſhop of* Rome; *next, his Son* Pipin *(whom the Biſhop of* Rome *made King of* France) *Laſtly,* Carolus Magnus *the Son of* Pipin, *and Emperour of the Weſt, utterly eradicats the Kingdom of the Lombards: and when he had done, in a Council at* Rome, *it is decreed firſt,* That no Biſhop(*not the Biſhop of* Rome *himſelf*) ſhould be inſtalled without inveſtiture from the Emperor by Staff and Ring, *and likewayes homage* more majorum, *which (as* Salvianus *interprets) was,* kiſſing of the Emperors foot. 2. That the Emperor and *his Succeſſors, ſhould have the preſentation of the Biſhop of* Rome, *and his Succeſſors; that is, ſhould have the* nomination *and* election *of the Biſhops of* Rome. 3. *The Biſhop of* Rome, *as we ſaid, called in the French againſt the Lombards, becauſe the ſaid Lombards required Tribute of him for the* Roman Territories: Carolus Magnus *having deſtroyed the Lombards, makes the Biſhop of* Rome *pay the ſame Tribute, pretending the ſame reaſons which the Lombards did,* viz. *becauſe the Biſhops of* Rome *were accuſtomed to pay that Tribute to the Grecian Emperors, to whom he had ſucceeded in the Dominion of the Weſt.*

And thus it appears, what little regard Carolus Magnus *had to the authority of the* Biſhop of Rome, *either ſpiritual or temporal: The firſt appears, the Biſhop of* Rome *had exaucторated the Grecian Emperors, for being enemies to* Image-worſhip; *and for that reaſon, gave to* Carolus Magnus *the Empyre of the Weſt,* (*at leaſt as much as in him lay*) Carolus Magnus *takes the Empire, but in the mean time, in the Council of* Franckford, *he procures thoſe very Biſhops of* Rome, *who had beſtowed upon himſelf the Empire, to be acclared Idolaters and Hereticks, for eſtabliſhing* Image-worſhip; *and conſequently, for depoſing the Grecian Emperors, becauſe they were againſt Images, and for giving to himſelf their Empire in the Weſt for that reaſon. The ſecond appears thus, the Biſhop of* Rome *calls in the French againſt the Lombards, becauſe they demanded Tribute of him, for the Territories about* Rome: Carolus Magnus *deſtroyes the Lombards, and when he had done, makes the* Biſhop of Rome *pay the ſame Tribute to himſelf and his Succeſſors; and not ſo content, ordains they ſhould do him homage,* more majorum; *That is* (*according to* Salvianus) by kiſſing of of his foot.

Tenthly, your Lordſhips will find this Monſter ſtill ſo bridled, untill the decay of the poſterity of Carolus Magnus; *and then the Empire was tranſlated to the Germans, the Kingdom of* France *to the Family of* Hugh Capet. Otho primus *Emperour, ſon of* Henricus Auceps, *the firſt German Emperour, renewed that power of the Emperour, his nomination and election of* the Biſhop of *Rome, which the former* Biſhops of Rome *had taken from the Emperours, during the decay and ſlouth of the poſterity of* Carolus Magnus: *but a little after that, the myſtery of Iniquity working, foretold by* Paul, 2 Theſſ. 2. *the* Biſhops of Rome, *by the counſel of one* Hildebrand, *afterwards Pope* Gregory *ſeventh, ordained the Colledge of Cardinals for election of the Pope; which manner of election was utterly unknown to the Ancients, the firſt* Pope *who ordained this Colledge of Cardinals*

dinals was Nicolaus 2*d. who lived* anno, 1060. *which manner of Election continueth unto this day.*

The ſaid Hildebrand, *becoming afterwards Pope, took upon him to depoſe Emperors:* Anno, 1074. *he depoſed* Henry 4*th. Emperour, and gave the Empire to* Rodolphus, *becauſe* Henry *would not renunce the inveſtiture of Biſhops; this* Hildebrand *raiſed many broils and troubles, and was believed by many learned men of the Church of* Rome *(who lived about that time)* to be Antichriſt; *his Succeſſors eſpecially, after the times of the Jeſuits, ſtill augmented that Doctrine,* of depoſing Kings by the Pope: *and it is now defended, not only in Books printed by the Popes Authority, and by all the Canoniſts, but alſo aſſumed by Popes unto themſelves in their Bulls, as appears by thoſe Bulls of* Gregory 7*th. againſt* Henry 4*th. Emperor; of* Alexander 3*d. againſt* Frederick *the Emperor; of* Boniface 8*th. againſt* Philip *King of* France; *of* Julius *ſecond againſt* Lewis *twelfth King of* France, *and againſt the King of* Navarre; *of* Paul *third againſt* Henry 8*th. King of* England; *of* Pius 4*th. againſt Queen* Elizabeth; *of* Sixtus 5*th. againſt* Henry 3*d. and* 4*th. Kings of* France.

When Phocas *by Edict, made* Bonifacius 3*d.* Biſhop *of* Rome, univerſal Biſhop; *the thing he gave him was little better then a bare Title. We have ſhewed two ſteps, by which the Biſhops of* Rome *advanced; the firſt is, his freeing himſelf from the election of the Emperor; the ſecond, his aſſuming to himſelf* power of depoſing Kings and Emperors: *the third ſtep after* Phocas, *was aſſuming to himſelf* authority of convocating General Councils, of preſiding in them, of confirming and infirming them. *We do not read, that any Pope aſſumed that power to himſelf, the firſt nine hundered years after Chriſt: It is evident, by Hiſtory, that during the time of the firſt eight general Councils, the* Biſhops *of* Rome *had no ſuch power, ſince it appears, they were all convocated by the Emperor, that others beſide the Biſhop of* Rome *preſided in many of them, and the Emperor con-*

firmed them all. What Pope first assumed to himself that power, we find not expresly before the time of Innocent 3d. *in the Council of* Lateran, *anno*, 1210. *since which time, the succeeding* Popes *constantly took upon them to convocat general Councils, to preside in them, and to confirm them.*

The fourth step of the Bishop of Rome, *after* Phocas, *is his* Infallibity; *which was first conferred upon him, by the Council of* Florence, anno, 1439. *and afterward confirmed and taught by the Jesuites, and Canonists, it being held as ane article of Faith, in the Church of* Rome, *that the Pope* in Cathedra, or teaching the whole Church, cannot err: *yea, some of them maintain,* (*as* Albertus Pighius *and others*) *that the* Pope *cannot be an heretick, which* Bellarmine *calls a pious opinion: but your Lordships will find it proved, part third,* lib. 2. *that innumerable* Popes, *have not only been hereticks, and so declared by other* Popes, *and general Councils, but also, that they have taught heresie, and have been condemned by general Councils,* for teaching heresie, *as Pope* Honorius *was condemned by three* successive general Councils, *the sixth, seventh, and eight, and of late Pope* Engenius *by the Councills of* Basill: *By whence it appears, that this Doctrine of the* Popes infallibility, *is not only* heresie, *but* madness, *fighting against common sense, reason, and the light of all History.*

Any would think, that the Bishop of Rome *could mount no higher, since already,* he is Monarch of the whole World, both in Spirituals and Temporals. *We have seen him hitherto, taking upon him power of deposing Kings, and Emperours, of transferring Kingdomes at his pleasure, of coyning Articles of Faith* (*under the notion of infallibility*) *oblieging the whole Church: yet in the last place, your Lordships will find him in the fourth part of this Dispute, sitting in the temple of God, adorned with all the marks of Antichrist, intending a* gigantomachy, *as if he intended to pull God out of the Heavens, taking*

ing upon him, not only to equal his decretal Epiſtles to holy Scripture, but alſo to prefer them unto it; in ſeveral of them, decerning againſt the Law of God, openly avowing, he has power ſo to do; injoyning it, to the whole Church to be believed, under pain of hereſie, that he hath ſuch power. Your Lordſhips will find, that in the Canon Law, he is called Dominus Deus noſter Papa, our Lord God the Pope: *that he takes upon him, not only to pardon ſins for money, both by-paſt, and to come, but alſo for a peice of money, to ſuffer the Clergy to wallow in whoredome; albeit againſt all pure Antiquity, he expreſly inhibits them marriage. Your Lordſhips will find it proved, that in the ſaid Canon Law, he affirms himſelf, by reaſon of his ſucceſſion to* Peter, *to be aſſumed, to the ſociety of the individual Trinity; that for money, he will command the Angels to take ſouls out of purgatory, and place them ſtraight in Paradiſe: And in a word, your Lordſhips will find him,* that man of ſin deſcribed by the Apoſtle, ſitting in the Temple of God, exalting himſelf above all that are called God, caling himſelf God, teaching the doctrine of devils, forbidding meats, forbidding marriage, making the Kings of the earth drunk with his abominations, corrupting all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, taking from them, adding to them at his pleaſure: *and as he groweth in power, depravation of Religion encreaſeth with it, following the increments of his authority, as the motion of the Sea, depends upon the Moon.*

In purer Antiquity, when there was no evidence of the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of Rome *at all, there was no corruption in Doctrine, Religion was unſpotted: but when the Biſhop of* Rome, *enriched by the liberality of the Emperours, became proud, and aimed to uſurp over the Church, corruption in Doctrine encreaſed apace, with their increments of power. Conſult Hiſtory, and your Lordſhips will find, at every ſtep of the Popes advancement in power, a depravation in Doctrine accompanying*

ing

ing it: your Lordſhips will likewayes find it proved, part fourth, lib. 2. *that the Doctrine of the modern Church of* Rome, *is nothing elſe* but a maſſe of depravations, corruptions, hereſies, brought in by Biſhops of *Rome*, as they advanced in authority, the Doctrine of the firſt ſix Centuries being quite extinct. *Notwithſtanding all the braggings of our adverſaries*, of their Antiquity, *your Lordſhips will find*, in the firſt ſix hundred years after Chriſt, that the Doctrine now profeſſed by the modern Church of *Rome*, was altogether unknown, and had not a beeing; *or if any of their modern Tenets were mentioned by the Writers in thoſe times, it was with deteſtation*, under the notion of Hereſie, *and oppoſed by the whole Church. If your Lordſhips think this incredible, ye will find it proved*, part 4. lib. 2. *of this treatiſe, by an* induction *of all thoſe Tenets, which the Church of* Rome *hold contrary to the Doctrine of the reformed Churches.*

My Lords and Gentlemen, *In the laſt place, you will find it proved, by what practices the Biſhop of* Rome *maintains himſelf in that prodigious greatneſs, and his Doctrine? None can but admire how he hath been ſo long undiſcovered? and how ſo many learned and pious men, brave ſpirits, can be ſo bewitched yet, as to believe,* that communion with him, is neceſſary unto ſalvation; and that all who acknowledge not his power and Doctrine, ought to be condemned as Hereticks. *But their admiration may ceaſe, ſince the Spirit of God affirms,* that the Kings of the earth ſhall be drunk with his abominations; *that is, ſhall be void of all ſpiritual underſtanding, that the glory of God may be manifeſted in his imperveſtigable wayes, till at laſt, that* wicked one *be conſumed* by the breath of his mouth, *that is, by the ſincere preaching of the Goſpel. The cup of iniquity of that* Monſter, *was not yet full, untill he began ſo far to forget himſelf, as to prefer himſelf to God, and make publick ſale of forgiveneſs of ſins for money; that is, by giving pardons unto men, not only*

for

for ſins by-paſt, but alſo to be committed afterwards, giving to this Courtier, the money obtained for the pardon of ſins obtained in one Countrey, to that of another. It is reported of Alexander *the ſixth, that when it was told him, that his Son* Cæſar Burgia *had loſt a hudge ſum of money at Dice; he anſwered, that his Son had loſt nothing but* the ſins of the Germans; *that is, the money which he had got for the ſale of pardons in that Nation. When his impiety came to ſuch a height, he was at laſt diſcovered by* Luther, *a poor* Frier; *ſince which time, they have left no ſort of cruelty and impoſtures unattempted, to preſerve their Power and their Doctrine.*

And firſt for their cruelty towards thoſe who oppoſed them, death without torture was thought a clemency; *the ordinar puniſhment of ſuch was,* burning alive; *and if they were ſo numerous, that it could not be conveniently done, they trained them into ſnares, by perfidious Treaties, cutting their throats when they were aſleep, without regard to the publick Faith given them; as appears by the horrible maſſacre at* Paris, *and other places of* France: *and albeit popiſh Writers, in thoſe times, deteſted that perfidious cruelty; yet the Pope himſelf, who was the Author, and contriver of it, made Proceſſions of joy, and Bone-fires at* Rome, *for the ſucceſs of it.*

As for their impoſtures, by which they maintain their Power and Doctrine, they are ſo many, that they are ſcarce numerable: the main are preferring the corrupt Latine verſion of the Scripture, to the Greek and Hebrew Fountains, held authentick by the Primitive Church, *and the Church of* Rome *it ſelf. Secondly,* by adding Books to the Canon of the Scripture, againſt all the current of Antiquity, *to authorize ſome of their idolatrous Tenets. 3. They make the Pope* the infallible Interpreter of Scripture, *albeit perhaps he had never read one ſyllable in it, or at leaſt underſtood nothing in it; as appears of late, by that paſſage of* Innocent 10*th. (related by*

Sanct

Sanct Amour, *in his Journal) who being preſſed to determine a Controverſie in Religion, between the* Janſeniſts *and* Moliniſts, *anſwered*, he was an old man, and had never ſtudied Divinity, neither did it belong to his profeſſion. 4. *They have corrupted all the Writings of the Ancients, adding to them, taking from them at their pleaſure; as appears by the Edition of the Fathers, ſet forth by* Manutius *at the Popes command, againſt all the Manuſcript Copies, and old printed Copies, before* anno, 1564. *neither are they aſhamed of it, avowing it in their* indices expurgatorii: *and not content with corrupting of Antiquity, they alſo forge, not only particular teſtimonies of Fathers, but alſo whole Treatices.* Æneas Silvius, *who was afterwards Pope himſelf, under the name of* Pius 2d. *confeſſed ingenuouſly*, that no regard was held to the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, before the Council of *Nice*, or anno, 325. *and yet they produce ſix and thirty decretal Epiſtles of Popes, as ſo many Knights of the Poſt, to bear falſe witneſs for it in that interval, acknowledged to be forged, by* Cuſanus, Contius, *and other great Antiquaries of the Church of* Rome, *neither are they much regarded by* Bellarmine *and* Barronius *themſelves. Again, the moſt ingenuous Doctors of the* Romiſh Church, *and their greateſt Antiquaries confeſs, that nothing can be gathered from the Council of* Nice, *for the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of* Rome; *Yea, all Antiquity acknowledged only twenty Canons of the ſaid Council of* Nice: *Yet the Jeſuits of late, have found out two* Arabick Editions, *in which, fifty Canons are added to thoſe twenty: ſo palpably forged, that he is blind, who doth not ſee it. Yea, they are acknowledged for ſuch, by the moſt learned men of the Church of* Rome. *The main ſcope of thoſe forged Canons, is to prove ſeveral principal Tenets, of the* Popiſh *Religion, eſpecially the* Popes *Supremacy, That they are forged, ſhall be proved*, part 2. lib. 1.

Laſtly, the Biſhops of Rome *maintain their authority, and*

Doctrine

Doctrine, by false miracles, Saints and Revelations; *but mainly by those two damned cheats*, implicit faith *and* infallibility; *that is, they make their disciples believe that all is Gospel*, what the Pope affirmeth *in Cathedra*, and that he cannot erre teaching the whole Church: *which is the main cheat by which they lead innumerable souls to destruction.*

My Lords and Gentlemen, *This much of the* nobility, utility *and* jucundity *of the Subject which I present unto your protection; in which, I have shortly shadowed forth the steps of the Bishop of* Rome, *to his present greatness, and by what artifices he maintains himself in it? The second thing I desired your Lordships to observe, is the method I use in the discovery of this grand Impostor. I am informed, some tax me of presumption, for medling with such a Subject, after the Labours of so many Learned men, to whose diligence, nothing could be added.*

But I answer, as it were ill manners in me to tax those brave men that went before me in this Subject, of omission or slackness; So I am confident, none will blame me with any shew of reason, except first he consider what I say. It is true indeed, many have written before me, but it is as true, that some of them have written too dogmatically, *some too* historically; *both which wayes are lost labour in this Subject, in which all the probations are testimonies: but that they can be understood without the knowledge of History, no man can perswade me, though never so learned. On the other hand, History without Disputation, may delight the ear, as any other empty flish of Rhetorick, but it will never satisfie the mind ruled by reason. I strive to relate the History of the* Papacy *and* Popish Religion, *fighting with Disputation at every step: neither make I use further of History, then to illustrat the Dispute, which is my chief aim. I resemble most, the way of* Du Plesis, *whether I be a plagiarian from him, let the Reader judge; and also, whether my method be the same with his.*

He was a brave man, and a great Ornament to the Proteſtant Religion; *but he hath many* conciſe rhetorications, *to underſtand which, much knowledge of Antiquity is requiſite; otherwayes, theſe paſſages of his are ſo many* ænigmata *to beginners of the ſtudy of Antiquity, whoſe utility I principally aim at in this Work, that ſailing about the doors in this little Barge, they may learn by degrees to ſail in the great Ships of others, throughout the immenſe Ocean of Antiquity. The method I uſe, is this following; if any in reaſon ſhall not think it fit, after reaſonable inſtruction of my error, I ſhall make a recantation.*

My Lords, *The whole Treatiſe is taken up in the examination of theſe* three Queſtions; *the firſt is,* If *Peter* was ordained by our Saviour Monarch of the Church, or viſible Head of the Church under Himſelf? *The ſecond is,* If at the command of Chriſt, he took the charge of the Biſhoprick of *Rome? The third is.* It by divine Inſtitution, the Biſhop of *Rome* ſucceeded to *Peter* in the Monarchy of the Church? *And whereas our adverſaries of the Church of* Rome, *endeavour to prove the* affirmatives *of theſe three queſtions by Antiquity, that is,* teſtimonies of Councils and Fathers; *my ſcope is,* to diſprove the ſaid three affirmatives in the ſame manner, *and to prove, that all what they pretend from Antiquity, is either* wreſted, perverted, mutilated, falſly tranſlated from the Originals, or forged down-right.

The whole Treatiſe is divided in four Parts; the firſt Part is entituled, of Biſhops, *and contains the Hierarchy of the Church, unto the death of* Cyprian, *which was after the middle of the third Age: In which interval, I endeavour to prove, there was no ordinar Office in the Church,* above that of a Biſhop; *and that the Biſhop of* Rome *was in no more Authority then any other Biſhop albeit he was firſt Biſhop* in dignity, *becauſe* Biſhop of the old Imperial City. *This firſt part is divided in two Books, in the firſt is diſputed* the Monarchy of *Peter, by his* inſtitution,

prero-

prerogatives *and* carriage, *and* teſtimonies of Fathers, *unto* cap. 22. *In the reſt of that Book is diſputed*, if ever *Peter* was at *Rome? and if he were*, if he was Biſhop of *Rome?*

In the ſecond Book, is diſputed, if the Biſhop *of* Rome *was* acknowledged, *as ſucceſſor to* Peter *in the Monarchy of the Church, before the death of* Cyprian? *In which Book, I inſiſt moſt upon theſe following particulars; First, I relate the opinion of* Aerius *and his followers, concerning the Original Progreſſe, and univerſal eſtabliſhment of Epiſcopacy; wherein a Biſhop differs from a Preſbyter? and for what reaſons Epiſcopacy was brought into the Church? 2. I prove by the teſtimonies of* Ignatius, Dionyſius, *and* Cyprian *himſelf, that there was no Office in the Church, in that interval, above that of a* Biſhop. 3. *I anſwer ſeveral teſtimonies, pretended by thoſe of the Church of* Rome, *to prove the Popes Supremacy in that interval, from* Actions of Popes, Appellations to them, *and from teſtimonies of Greek and Latine Fathers.* 4. *I examine ſeveral Forgeries and Corruptions of the Fathers, made uſe of by ſome* Roman Doctors, *to prove the Supremacy of the Biſhop of* Rome *in that Interval.*

The ſecond Part is intituled, of Arch-biſhops; *in which I diſput the Hierarchy of the Church, from the death of* Cyprian, *unto the beginning of the* ſeventh Century, *or to* anno, 604. *at which time, the Emperor* Phocas *took the title of* univerſal Biſhop *from* Cyriacus, *Patriarch of* Conſtantinople, *and beſtowed it upon* Bonifacius *third, Biſhop of* Rome; *which is an interval of* 344. *years. It is divided in two Books, the firſt, intitulated*, of Metrapolitans; *In which I diſput, the Hierarchy of the Church, from* Cyprian, anno, 260. *unto the Council of* Chalcedon, anno, 453. *all which time, no Office was in the Church, above that of a* Metrapolitan: *inſiſting moſt upon theſe following particulars, firſt, of the original, progreſſe, and univerſal eſtabliſhment of* Metrapolitants;

litans; *wherein a* Metrapolitan *differ from another Bishop? For what reason, Metrapolitans were brought into the Church? What place the Bishop of* Rome *had, amongst Metrapolitans? where I prove, by unanswerable testimonies of Antiquity, that other Metrapolitans were of* alike Jurisdiction with him, *and that he was only*, first Metrapolitan in dignity, *for the same reason that he was* first Bishop *in the interval of* Bishops, viz. *because he was* Bishop *in the* Chief Imperial City. 2. *Traceing the lives of the Bishops of* Rome, *in that interval, I disput* pro, *and* contra, *the Supremacy of the Bishop of* Rome *in it, by their actions, usurpations, addesses made to them, and Acts of general, and particular Councils, celebrated in each of their times.* 3. *I examine the opinions of Greek and Latine Fathers, who lived in that interval, concerning the Supremacy of the Bishop of* Rome *in it.* 4. *I examine some notable forgeries, pretended by those of the Church of* Rome, *to prove the Pops supremacy in that interval.*

The second Book *is entituled*, of Patriarchs, *containing the Hierarchy of the Church, from the Council of* Chalcedon, anno, 453. *to* Phocas *and* Bonifacius, anno, 604. *In which Interval,* Patriarchs *obtained the chief place of the* Hierarchy; *insisting also upon those five particulars;* 1. *Of the original, progresse, and universal establishment of* Patriarchs, *wherein a Patriarch differs from a Metrapolitan? for what reasons Patriarchs were brought in the Church? what place the Bishop of* Rome *had amongst Patriarchs?* viz. *all* Patriarchs *were alike to him in* Jurisdiction: *Yet he was the* first Patriarch *in dignity, for the same reason that he was first Bishop in the Interval of* Bishops, *and first* Metrapolitan *in the Interval of* Metrapolitans, *that is for civil respects* (*and not by* reason of succession to Peter in the Monarchy of the Church;) *because* Rome *was the old imperial City, of which he was* Patriarch. 2. *Traceing the lives of the Bishops of* Rome, *of that interval,*

interval, I diſput their Supremacy from their Actions, Uſurpations, Addreſſes made to them, from general and particular Councils, celebrated in their time. 3. *I examine the opinions of Greek and Latine Fathers, who lived in that Interval, concerning the Supremacy of the Biſhop of* Rome *in it.* 4. *I examine thoſe Forgeries, pretended by thoſe of the Church of* Rome, *to prove the Supremacy of the Biſhop of* Rome *in that Interval.* 5. *I minut that notable controverſie, betwixt the Biſhops of* Rome *and* Conſtantinople *for the* Primacy: *ſhowing what was the occaſion of that conteſt? for what* Primacy *they ſtrove? by what reaſon they pleaded? and who carried it in the end?* viz. John (*called* Jejunator, *or the Faſter*) Patriarch *of* Conſtantinople, *who firſt of all was ſtiled* œcumenick Biſhop, *anno*, 580. *which was continued in his ſucceſſors to* anno, 604. *at which time*, Phocas (*before whom* Bonifacius *third* Biſhop *of* Rome *renewed the Proceſſe, knowing that* Phocas *the Emperor, carried no good will to* Cyriacus, Patriarch *of* Conſtantinople; *he ſtruck the Iron while it was hot*) *after much contention, pronounced in his favour.*

The third Part, entituled, of an œcumenick Biſhop, *contains the Hiſtory of that interval, between* anno, 600. *and the Council of* Trent. *It is divided in two Books, in the firſt, I inſiſt moſt on thoſe following particulars,* 1. *What power was conferred by* Phocas, *with that title of* univerſal Biſhop, *upon* Bonifacius *third Biſhop of* Rome? 2. *How the edict of* Phocas *was obſerved?* viz. *reſiſted every where, till in the end it was recalled by* Pogonatus, anno, 680. *in the ſixth general Council, as was ſhewed before.* 3. *How during the viciſſitudes of inundations of Barbarians, the Biſhop of* Rome *re-aſſumed that title of* univerſal Biſhop, *and uſurped power in* temporals *over the Grecian Emperors, as was already declared.* 4. *How* Carolus Magnus *curbed him.* 5. *How, when the poſterity of* Carolus

Magnus

Magnus *decayed, he renewed and augmented his power by five ſteps, as we ſhewed before alſo.*

In the ſecond Book, *thoſe ſteps or increments of the* Papacy, *between* anno, 600. *and the* Cancel *of* Trent, *are dogmatically diſputed, by Scripture, Fathers, and it is proved, by teſtimonies of the moſt learned Antiquaries of the Church of* Rome, *that the oldeſt of thoſe ſteps, was not before* anno, 1000. *It is true indeed, that his* power in temporals, *was attempted firſt by* Conſtantine *Biſhop of* Rome, *againſt* Philippicus *Emperour of* Conſtantinople, anno, 720. *becauſe the ſaid* Philippicus *cauſed pull down thoſe Images of the Fathers of the ſixth general Council, placed in the Church of St.* Sophia, *at* Conſtantinople: *and a little after,* Gregory 2*d. and* 3*d.* Biſhops *of* Rome, *excommunicated* Leo Iſaurus, *and his ſon* Copronymus, *for the ſame quarrel of Images; but their inſolence was compeſced by* Carolus Magnus, *as we ſhewed before. Thoſe four ſteps are,* 1. Election by Cardinals. 2. Power of convocating general Councils, conſtantly preſiding in them, of confirming and infirming them, 3. *Power in temporals,* 4. *Infallibility: as for the laſt ſtep* Divinity, *it is diſputed in the fourth Part,* lib. 2.

The fourth and laſt Part of this Treatiſe, (*entituled,* of Antichriſt) *is divided in two Books; in the firſt, the demonſtrations of* Sanderus, Bellarmine, *and* Leſſius, (*three Jeſuits*) *are anſwered, by which they endeavour to prove,* that the Biſhop of *Rome* is not Antichriſt. 2. *The* Biſhop *of* Rome *is proved to be Antichriſt by Scripture, Fathers, Popiſh Doctors, yea, by the teſtimonies of ſome Popes themſelves.*

In the ſecond Book, *two marks of Antichriſt are chiefly inſiſted upon, the firſt is, his* defection, 2 Theſſ. 2. *where it is proved, that the Doctrine of the Modern* Church *of* Rome *is that defection, mentioned by the Apoſtle, and that in the firſt ſix Centuries there was no ſuch thing, as the* modern Popiſh Religion; *which is proved, by an* induction *of all the* contraverted points

points *we have with the Church of* Rome. 2. *Becauſe thoſe of the Church of* Rome *ordinarily object, that they have not made a defection, becauſe it cannot be inſtructed at what time it was made? by whom? and who reſiſted it? Two things are proved in the ſaid Book; firſt, it is proved by Reaſon, Experience, Scripture, Fathers, that a defection may be made, and yet it may be unknown by whom it is made? at what time? and who firſt reſiſted it? 2. It is proved by an induction, that moſt of the moſt ſubſtantial Tenets of the Church of* Rome *(ſuch as* tranſubſtantiation, number of the Sacraments, communion under one kind, ſacrifice of the Maſs, imperfection of the Scripture, equalling of traditions to it, adding a Apocrypha Books to it, rejecting the Greek and Hebrew as not being authentick, as making the corrupt vulgar Latine verſion authentick, free-will Merits, juſtification by Works, cælibat of Prieſts, worſhiping of Images, invocation of Saints, ſet Faſts, Prayer for the dead, Purgatory, Indulgences, works of ſuper-erogation, all the ſteps of the Popes Supremacy, *&c.) were not only not from the beginning, but alſo it is proved for the moſt part (by teſtimonies of Popiſh Doctors themſelves) at what time? and by whom? the ſaid Tenets, as innovations, were brought in the Church.*

The ſecond mark of Antichriſt *we inſiſt upon is, that* παση απατη, all ſort of deceiving and fraud, 2 *Theſ.* 2. *where it is ſhewed, by what cheats the authority of the Biſhop of* Rome *and his Doctrine are maintained; ſuch as* perverting, falſly tranſlating and corrupting (*by adding and paring of the* indices expurgatorii) *all the Writings of the Ancients, Suppoſitions, Revelations, Saints, Miracles,* &c.

My Lords and Gentlemen, *Thus I have repreſented unto you, what I perform in this great Subject, and what method I obſerve in it: By which it will appear to any reaſonable man, what difference there is between this method, and that of others, if*

I per-

I perform what I promiſe; of which, let the judicious Reader be judge. Now followeth the third thing, which I deſired your Lordſhips to take to conſideration, viz. *what my ſcope and intention is? which is twofold, the firſt is, to refute thoſe marks, by which thoſe of the Church of* Rome *endeavour to perſwade their Diſciples, that the ſaid Church of* Rome *is the true Church.*

The firſt mark is, a continual ſucceſſion of Biſhops; *which they take great pains to enumerat, from the dayes of the Apoſtles, unto this time: In which mark ſhall be proved a four-fold cheat; The firſt is, they make the world believe, that all thoſe Biſhops* were of a like greatneſs in Power and Authority; *whereas it is proved, that in the firſt three Centuries, or at leaſt before the dayes of* Cyprian, *that every Biſhop was* of equal authority with the Biſhop of *Rome: And that between the times of* Cyprian, *and the Council of* Chalcedon, every Metropolitan, *and from the Council of* Chalcedon *to* anno, 604. every Patriarch were of equal juriſdiction to him: *And when he was made univerſal Biſhop by* Phocas, *little more then a bare title was beſtowed on him, and yet that was after revocked, by the ſixth general Council. As for thoſe five ſteps we mentioned before (in which chiefly the Modern Power of the Pope conſiſts)* viz. Election by Cardinals; 2. Authority of convocating general Councils; 3. Temporal juriſdiction; 4. Infability; 5. and Divinity, *it ſhall be proved (as we ſaid before) by the teſtimonies of Popiſh Doctors themſelves, that the oldeſt of them, had not a being in the tenth Age: and that the ſaid Popiſh Doctors, acknowledging the ſucceſſion of the Biſhop of* Rome *to* Peter *in the Monarchy of the Church, nevertheleſs, ſome of them doubted not to call the* Biſhop of Rome Antichriſt, *by reaſon of theſe ſteps, which they call* tyrannical Antichriſtian uſurpations.

The ſecond Cheat, in that mark of ſucceſſion *is, that they make ignorants believe,* that all the Biſhops of *Rome,* ſince the

the times of the Apostles, professed the same Doctrine which is now taught in the Church of *Rome: whereas it shall be proved, that the Doctrine of the modern Church of* Rome *had not a beeing the first six hundred years after Christ; that it had some notable beginning, about that time when* Bonifacius 3*d. was made first* universal Bishop, *and encreased afterwards, as the power of the Bishop of* Rome *encreased, the one following the other, as the motion of the Sea follows the Moon; that many of the most substantial points of the modern Roman Faith, were never generally established, before the cape-stone of the Popes power was laid at the Councils of* Florence *and* Trent, *at which two Councils, many Tenets were established, with an* anathema, *as Articles of Faith, believed to be so many paradoxes by the most learned men in the Church of* Rome, *who lived in those times, who spared not to exclaim against the fraudulent proceeding of the Pope, who carried all by plurality of voices in these two Councils:* 1. *By multitude of Italian Bishops:* 2. *By titular Bishops, that is, Bishops having imaginary Titles in the East, as* Jerusalem, Antioch, *&c. Which Bishops he created purposely, that by the number of their voices, and of the Italian Bishops, he might bear down in these two Councils, the voices of the Bishops of* Germany, Spain *and* France.

The third Cheat in that mark of succession is, that they make ignorants believe, that all those Bishops, were lawfully elected: *but it shall be proved in the following Dispute, that some were elected by* Blood, *others by* Simony, *others by* unlawful Stipulations, and Pre-contracts to establish Heresie in the Church, and to condemn the Orthodox Doctrine as heretical; *others of them* by a paction with the Devil; *yea, it shall be proved, by the most eminent Antiquaries of the Church of* Rome *it self, that since* Nicolaus secundus, *who lived in the* eleventh Century, *there has not been one Bishop of* Rome *elected* according to the Law of God, and Constitutions of

the primitive Church: *and that their manner of election, at this day, is ſo deteſtable, that none can hear of it without horror.*

The fourth Cheat in that mark of ſucceſſion is this, we have redacted that ſucceſſion to a number of perſons, of unequal power, contrary Doctrine, unlawfully elected; now reſts a bare perſonal ſucceſſion, *in which there is a notable Cheat alſo; becauſe they obtrude for the true Succeſſor, perſons that are not capable, by their own principles, of the Function; as appears by three unanſwerable reaſons: The firſt is,* a woman was Pope *for ſeveral years together; and whereas* Bellarmine *and* Baronius, *affirms, it was a fiction; it is anſwered, ſince thoſe Hiſtorians who relate it for a truth, lived in thoſe very times, in which it fell out, or at leaſt, very near them; and ſince thoſe who call it a fable, lived long after, and are but of yeaſter-day, in reſpect of thoſe who affirm it to be of a truth, no judicious Reader needs to be puzled much, which party to believe; ſince thoſe who called it a* truth, *profeſſed themſelves to be as obedient Sons to the Church of* Rome, *as thoſe who call it a* fable.

The ſecond reaſon, againſt the continuity of that perſonal ſucceſſion, is this; the Chair *of* Rome *hath been for ſeveral years empty, and without a Biſhop: and whereas they affirm,* that the power then of the Biſhop, is in the Cardinals; *it ſhall be proved, by their own Learned Antiquaries, that the modern power of thoſe Cardinals, was a thing unkown to the Ancients; and to be nothing elſe, but a new deviſed Cheat.*

The third reaſon, againſt that perſonal ſucceſſion, is this, it is known to all who are verſed in Hiſtory, that many Popes have been at one time, and the ſubtilleſt Wits amongſt them could never yet decern, which was the true Succeſſor? and which not? one part of the Church adhering to the one, another to the other, another

that to the third Pope: As happened in the time of the Council of Conſtance, *anno*, 1416. *at which time there were three Popes. It is certain, one of them could be only* the true Pope, *and yet all of them created Cardinals; ſome of which not only created other Popes afterwards, but alſo* became Popes themſelves: *but thoſe Cardinals*, who received orders from the falſe Popes, are by their own Principles, incapable of electing Popes, much more of being Popes themſelves. *It muſt of neceſſity follow, that many Popes have been at innumerable times, Biſhops of* Rome *not lawful; which quite deſtroyes* that perſonal ſucceſſion. *They are preſſed with the ſame difficulty in the caſe of* Simony; *It is granted by themſelves, that many Biſhops of* Rome have obtained that Chair by Simony: *It is granted alſo by them,* that thoſe are not lawful Popes, that thoſe ordained by them are incapable of Orders. *It is confeſſed by them alſo, that ſeveral Popes obtaining the Chair by* Simony, have created Cardinals which elected other Popes, and ſome of them alſo became Popes themſelves; *which quite deſtroyeth* that uninterrupted perſonal ſucceſſion, *as they cannot deny. And this much of that firſt mark of the true Church, pretended by the Romaniſts, to prove* the Church of *Rome* to be the true Church, *viz.* ſucceſſion of Biſhops.

The ſecond mark is Antiquity, of which they brag very much, but have very little reaſon. Cicero, lib. 2. de Orator. *relates a paſſage between* Craſſus, *that famous Orator, and one* Silus, *who accuſed another perſon before the Senate, for uttering ſome dangerous expreſſions;* Craſſus *defends him thus*, It may be, *ſaith he*, that he ſpake theſe words in paſſion; *Silus* granted it might be: Craſſus *urgeth the ſecond time*, It may be you underſtood not what he ſaid; Silus *ſeemed not averſe to that neither:* Craſſus *goeth on the third time*, It may be, *ſaith he*, that ye affirm, that ye heard him utter theſe ſpeeches, whereas ye heard no ſuch thing at all: *at which* Silus *was confounded, and*

replyed nothing at all, then all the company fell a laughing. Thoſe inſtances of Craſſus *againſt* Silus, *may fitly be urged againſt our Adverſaries of the Church of* Rome, *bragging of the teſtimonies of Antiquity, that is, of Councils and Fathers. His firſt inſtance was, that the perſon accuſed by* Silus, *perhaps was in paſſion, but it is known, and ſhall be proved, that thoſe of the Church of* Rome *are ſeconded by no teſtimonies of Antiquity at all, but either they are of* Biſhops of *Rome* themſelves, or elſe of their flatterers. *But* Æneas Silvius *(afterwards Pope himſelf, under the name of* Pius 2d.*) in his Commentaries upon the Council of* Baſile, *hath theſe following expreſsions againſt ſuch teſtimonies; his words are,* Nec conſiderant miſeri quæ tantopere jactant verba, aut ipſorum ſummorum pontificum ſunt fimbrias ſuas extendentium, aut eorum qui iis adulabantur; *that is,* Neither do theſe miſerable men conſider, that thoſe teſtimonies of which they brag, are either of Biſhops of *Rome* themſelves, enlarging their own Authority, or elſe of thoſe who are their flatterers. *Now to the application;* Craſſus *reaſoned, that a teſtimony ſpoken in paſſion, ſhould not be regarded; but who will deny thoſe teſtimonies of* Biſhops of *Rome,* and of their vowed ſlaviſh flatterers, *to be ſpoken in paſſion, to be partial, and to merit no credit?*

Craſſus *ſecond inſtance was, that perhaps* Silus did not underſtand what the other ſaid: *This is alſo fitly applyed to thoſe of the Church of* Rome; *for, knowing that thoſe partial teſtimonies would not ſerve the turn, they flye* to fantaſtick Gloſſes of teſtimonies of the Ancients, *wearying themſelves and their Readers, by their* verboſity, *in ſuch Gloſſes, though never ſo* ſtrained *and* wreſted againſt the meaning of the Author, *as ſhall be proved to any capacity, in the leaſt meaſure capable of reaſon: and in effect, all the ſhelter they have in Antiquity, is either in* wilfully wreſting the Fathers, *or elſe* in their ſtrained Allegories, *as ſhall be made manifeſt in its own place,*

Lib.

part. 4. lib. 2. *yea, and almoſt through the whole Treatiſe.*

The third inſtance of Craſſus, *againſt* Silus, *was* falſe witneſſing: *that this may be applyed, to our Adverſaries, ſhall be proved alſo; that is, when thoſe teſtimonies of Popes and their Fathers, and thoſe perverted and wreſted teſtimonies of others, will not ſerve the turn, they uſe a twofold cheat, in* falſe witneſſing; *The firſt is, they have corrupted, by authority of the Pope, all the Writings of the Ancients, taking out what made againſt them. The ſecond cheat is, by* putting in, *and* forging, *what in effect*, was never in the writings of the Ancients, *as ſhall be unanſwerably proved in the following Diſput: yea, it ſhall appear*, part. 4. lib. 2. *that thoſe* forged teſtimonies being removed, the primitive Fathers, in the firſt ſix Centuries after Chriſt, profeſſed no other Doctrine, then the Doctrine now profeſſed by the Proteſtants, eſpecially by the Church of *England*; *which is the ſame Religion, with that of the firſt four general Councils; both in Doctrine and Diſcipline, in the eſtimation of* Gregorius Magnus *Biſhop of* Rome, *of little leſſe authority then the Scripture it ſelf. One thing is not to be omitted, they object the Proteſtants ſpeaking unreverently of Antiquity, which is a notorious untruth, whereas themſelves (when neither* wreſting falſly, tranſlating, adding and paring, and right-down forging teſtimonies of Antiquity will ſerve the turn) *ſpeak moſt unreverently of the Ancients, taxing* Auguſtinus, Hieronymus, *the ſecond and fourth general Councils, and conſequently, all the firſt eight general Councils (ſince in the particulars challenged by them, they all agreed) of* ignorance, madneſſe, hereſie, forgery.

The third mark is univerſality; *which is all one with* antiquity: univerſality *is twofold, firſt of* time, *that is*, the Doctrine of the Modern Church of *Rome* was received at all

times

times by the Church. *The ſecond is*, of place, *that is*, it was embraced in all places: *but the* Antiquity *of their Doctrine being related*, univerſality falls with it, *and likewayes* viſibility; *for if we prove*, *that the Doctrine of the Modern Church of* Rome (*in as far as it contradicts that of Proteſtants*) *is deviſed*, *and broached by degrees*, *ſince the* beginning of the ſeventh Century; *queſtionleſs*, *it was not* viſible in the firſt *ſix*. Antiquity *alſo*, *being refuted*, *their fifth mark*, infallibility *alſo falls with it*: *for* queſtionleſs, if the Doctrine of the Modern Church of *Rome*, be contrary to the Doctrine of the Primitive Church in the firſt ſix Centuries, they cannot have the brow to affirm, that their Modern Church of *Rome* is infallible, *ſince in ſo affirming*, *they will declare all the Ancients*, *that is*, Fathers and generall Councils, *in the firſt ſix hundred years after Chriſt*, *to* be Hereticks. *However*, it is moſt ſtrange impudence in them to pretend infallibility in their Church, *which ſome place* in general Councils, others in the Biſhop of *Rome*, in Cathedra: *which ever of the two they affirm*, *they are entangled.* If the firſt? *in it appears that of late*, *their general Councils* hath condemned one another of Hereſie, as the Council *of* Florence, the Councils of *Baſil* and *Conſtance*; and the Council of *Baſil*, that of *Florence*: *If they affirm in the laſt?* (viz. that the Pope hath Infallibility in *Cathedra*) *they are alſo entangled*, *for it ſhall be proved*, part. 3 lib. 2. *that many* Popes *in* Cathedra *have declared* other Popes teaching in *Cathedra* to be Hereticks: *but none but a mad man*, *or an Impoſtor will affirm*, *that* the infallibility of Popes in *Cathedra*, *can conſiſt with ſuch proceedings.*

The ſixth mark is Unity, *of which they brag very much*, *but with as little reaſon*, *as they did brag of* Antiquity. *They reaſon very prettily thus*: We of the Church of *Rome* (ſay they) agree amongſt our ſelves, in all ſubſtantial points of Faith:

Faith: whereas they who are not of our Church, do not ſo; ſome of them being *Calviniſts*, ſome *Lutherians*, ſome *Anabaptiſts*, ſome *Quakers*, ſome this, ſome that: whence it appears (*ſay they*) that our Church is the true Church.

But this ſophiſm is very eaſily retorted: we may as eaſily reaſon thus; We, whom ye call Calviniſts, *are at unity amongſt our ſelves, in ſubſtantial points, (there is no diſcord amongſt us, but in theſe two particulars, the firſt is*, anent Church-government, or the Divine right of Biſhops; *the ſecond is in that point*, of defenſive Armes againſt Kings; *both which differences, eſpecially the laſt, are in a far higher ſtrain amongſt your ſelves, as ye cannot without impudence deny*) *But ye who are out of our Church, do not agree amongſt your ſelves, ſome of you are* Papiſts, *ſome* Anabaptiſts, *ſome* Quakers, *&c.* Ergo, *we are the true Church.*

Secondly, to omit ſuch fooliſh reaſoning, there is not greater diſcord in hell, then is amongſt thoſe of the Church of Rome, *in points moſt ſubſtantial, and upon which, as hinges, the whole edifice of their Doctrine doth depend. It would be prolix to enumerat all their diſcords; we will only mention ſome few, the reſt we ſhall proſecute through the whole body of this Treatiſe: And firſt*, they generally brag of the Antiquity of their Doctrine, that it was from the beginning: *but it ſhall be proved, by teſtimony of their own Doctors, that moſt of their ſubſtantial Tenets, which they hold contrary to Proteſtants, are ſo many* innovations; *ſuch as* adding of Apocrypha Books to the Scripture, number of Sacraments, Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory, Indulgences, and all thoſe ſteps of the Popes Supremacy, *after* anno, 604. *Yea, it ſhall be proved by ſome of their greateſt Antiquaries, that the Biſhop of* Rome *was not acknowledged univerſal Biſhop by the Church, in the firſt ſix Centuries; and that* Cyprian *and* Auguſtine, *and many other of the Ancients, died out of communion with the Church of* Rome, *and yet are placed in their Calanders amongſt the Saints.*

Like-

Likewayes, the whole body of the Popiſh Religion depends upon the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of Rome, *it again upon the ſupremacy of* Peter, *it again upon his* inſtitution, carriage and teſtimonies of Fathers. *Let us hear how they agree in thoſe three.*

And firſt, his inſtitution is founded upon three paſſages of Scripture, Mat. 16. 18. Thou art *Peter,* and upon this Rock will I build my Church. *The ſecond is,* verſe 19. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. *The third is,* Joh. 21. 15. 16, 17. Feed my ſheep, feed my lambs. *But Cardinal* Cuſanus, *lib. 2. concord. Cathol. cap. 13. expreſly affirmes,* that in all thoſe three places, nothing was given in peculiar to *Peter,* which was not given to all the Apoſtles, *which he alſo proves by the teſtimony of* Hieronymus.

2. *The main* Baſis *of the Popes ſupremacy, is in the expoſition of theſe words,* Tu es Petrus, *viz.* That *Peter* is the Rock upon which the Church is built. Pighius *and* Baronius *and others affirm,* that all are ignorants, hereticks, mad men, who acquieſced not in this expoſition, That *Peter* is the Rock: *But it ſhall be proved, in the firſt ſix Chapters of the firſt Book, not only by innumerable teſtimonies of Popiſh Doctors, but alſo of a great many Popes themſelves, that not* Peter, *but the thing confeſſed by* Peter is the Rock, *viz. Chriſt himſelf.*

3. *Another* Baſis *of the Popiſh Religion is, that* Peter *had his juriſdiction immediatly from Chriſt, and the other Apoſtles theirs from* Peter (Bellarmine *and others affirm, that if this be not granted, the ſupremacy of* Peter *cannot be defended, and conſequently the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of* Rome, *and the whole body of the Popiſh Religion falls with it*) *But* Franciſcus de victoria (*affirmed by* Canus *to be the ableſt Divine of* Spain) *exſibilats this diſtinction of* Peters immediat juriſdiction, *and refutes the gloſs on* Cyprian, de unitate Eccleſiæ, *for exponing a paſſage in* Cyprian, *from which they gather this diſtinction, proving*

proving by the teſtimonies of Cyprian *himſelf* (*in that very place corrupted by the Gloſſe, which Gloſſe is approved by the Church of* Rome) *that* Cyprian *in theſe words, expreſly diſputs* againſt that immediat Juriſdiction of *Peter*, *and* mediat *of the other Apoſtles*; *and affirms, that all the Apoſtles* had, not only their order, but alſo their Juriſdiction immediatly from Chriſt.

4. They prove the Supremacy of *Peter*, by his carriage and prerogatives: *but* Salmero *the Jeſuit, expreſly affirms*, that nothing can be gathered from the carriage of *Peter*, to prove him œcumenick Biſhop, but much to the contrary; *Yea, the Council of* baſil *it ſelf pronounced, that the Legats of the Pope* had no right of preſiding in general Councils, becauſe it *could* neither be proved by Scripture, nor Antiquity, that ever *Peter* preſided in any *Council*; or at that of *Jeruſalem*.

5. *They brag much of* Cyprian, *that* he is for the Supremacy of *Peter*, and alſo *Auguſtin* and other Fathers: *but* Barronius *himſelf confeſſeth, that both* Cyprian, *and* Auguſtine, *died out of communion with the Church of* Rome, *for reſiſting her encroaching upon the Churches of* Africk, *that is, for admitting of Appellations, from* Africk *to* Rome: *for doing of which*, Bonifacius Secundus *Biſhop of* Rome *affirms*, *that* Aurelius, *and* Auguſtinus *were ſeduced by the Devil*, *and yet both of them are placed in the Roman Callender as Saints: and notwithſtanding all their braggings of* Cyprian, (let one *ſpeak for all ſaith* Barronius, in time moſt ancient, in learning moſt excellent, in martyrdom moſt glorious, for the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*) *yet* Stapleton *the Jeſuit, expreſly affirms, that* Cyprian *in that ſubject*, utitur verbis errantium, & mire hereticorum cauſæ patrocinari videtur. *And* Bellarmine *himſelf confeſſeth. that we do not read*, that ever *Cyprian* was reconciled to the Church of *Rome*, after his reſiſting of

Stephanus the Biſhop of *Rome*, his pretending right of Appellations from *Africa*.

And this much of their concord, and unity, in that Cardinal queſtion, of the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome: which falling*, Bellarmine (*as we ſaid*) *grants, that the whole body of the Popiſh Religion falls with it, comparing it, without the Supremacy of the* Biſhop of Rome, *to a houſe without a foundation; a man when his head is ſtricken off, to ſtar-light without the Sun. We could inſtance their diſcord, in many of their moſt ſubſtantial Tenets; what queſtion is of greater importance, then that of* Tranſubſtantiation? *It is the general opinion of the Doctors of the Church of* Rome, *that it was imbraced as an Article of Faith from the beginning; and yet thoſe two great Popiſh Doctors*, Scotus *and* Bonaventur, *expreſly maintain, that* Tranſubſtantiation was never believed as an Article of Faith, before the Council of *Lateran*, *anno*, 1225. *Yea*, Scotus *expreſly affirms, were it not for the authority of that Council, he would not believe it himſelf, it hath ſo little ground in Scripture, and Antiquity. The main ground of which prodigious Article, is thoſe words of our* Saviour, Hoc eſt corpus meum, *and other expreſſions of his*, John 6. *But it ſhall be proved*, part 4. lib. 2. *by the teſtimonies of many Popiſh Doctors, that nothing can be gathered from either place, for proving of it. It were too prolix in this* Preface, *to mention all the contradictions of the Doctors of the Church of* Rome, *in their moſt ſubſtantial Tenets: Your Lordſhips may read them at large, in the following Treatiſe, almoſt through the whole body of it, but moſt expreſly*, part 4. lib. 2. *where your Lordſhips will not only find* Doctors contradicting Doctors, but alſo Popes accuſing Councils, Councils accuſing Popes, Councils accuſing Councils, Popes in *Cathedra*, taxing Popes in *Cathedra*, of Hereſies, Madneſſe, Ignorance. *And this much of the ſixth*

mark

mark of the Church of Rome, *by which they pretend it is proved*, to be the true Church, *viz.* Unity.

The ſeventh mark is Saints; *they object to the Proteſtants*, that they lean too much on Chriſt, truſting nothing to their own merits; which occaſions ſo much prophaneneſſe amongſt them: *but we* (*ſay they*) *the Church of* Rome, are adorned with innumerable Saints, ſtirred up to holineſs, becauſe works are meritorious in the ſight of God: *quis tulerit gracchos, de ſeditione quærentes? Let us retex this mark of* Saints, *that we may ſee what reaſon they have to brag of it: And firſt, they cannot brag of* the Sanctity of their Clergy; *witneſſe the exclamations of all Ages*, againſt the corruption of the Clergy of the Church of *Rome*, when they got a little breathing from perſecution; *we need not mention the complaints, not only of the Ancients, but alſo of modern Popiſh Doctors, againſt the corruptions of the Clergy of* Rome. Cyprian *began the complaint in his time, when the Church was yet under perſecution: But when the Emperours became Chriſtians, the Clergy, by their beneficence, became rich.* Hieronymus *in his time, thirteen hundred years ago, was ſo irritated by the vicious lives of the Roman Clergy, that* (Damaſus *Biſhop of* Rome *dying, to whom he was Secretary*) *he left* Rome, *and went to* Paleſtina, *to live as a Monk, comparing* Rome *to* Babylon, and the ſeat of the Whore. *Ammianus Marcellinus*, (*in the opinion of* Baronius *a Pagan*) *declaimed bitterly againſt the viciouſneſſe of the Roman Clergy: It were tedious to mention, the complaints of theſe of the firſt ſix Centuries, againſt the viciouſneſs of the Roman Clergy, as of* Baſilius Magnus, Nazianzenus, Sulpitius, Severus *and others: as the greatneſſe of the Biſhop of* Rome *in power encreaſed, not only corruption in Doctrine, but alſo in manners, encreaſed with it; And after the Biſhop of* Rome *was made univerſal Biſhop, nothing could be added to the wickedneſs of the Clergy. The complaints of* Bernardus, Picus,

Merandula, *are notorious, and innumerable others. The corruptions of the Clergy moved them, not onely to call* Rome Babylon, *but also consequently, and not obscurely, the Bishop of* Rome Antichrist: *and yet both of them professed themselves, obedient Sons to the Church of* Rome. *In a word, since the times of* Cyprian, *no brave man lived in any Age unto this day, who did not complain of the corruption of the Roman Clergy: and so* heir Clergy cannot be their Saints.

Secondly, if they have little reason to brag of their Clergy, they have far lesse reason, to brag of the sanctity of their Popes: Baronius, Platina, *and* Onuphrius, *ingenuously confesse, that the World never produced such Monsters* for murtherers, Impoysoners, Adulterers, Symoniacks, Witches, *yea, and* Hereticks: *who but a mad man will affirm, that such persons cannot erre teaching the* Church? *Surely* Pighius *was out of his witts,* teaching that a Pope could not be an Heretick; *and* Bellarmine *no lesse, for calling that opinion of* Pighius, a pious opinion: *their feaver now is turned to a* Phrensie; *the Author of that Book entituled* Cardinalismo (*conscious to all the* Caball *of the Roman* Clergy) *affirms, that now they begin to teach at* Rome, that a Pope cannot be a reprobat; *which at last will turn to an Article of Faith, as well as* infallibility.

But because corruption of lives of the Clergy, doth not of necessity infer a false Church: We do not affirm, that the wickedness of their Clergy, or their Popes, proves them Idolaters in Doctrine; *we only affirm, that they have no reason to brag of either of them,* as Saints, to prove the Church of *Rome* to be the true Church. *And although they were so, it is no infallible mark; for it may be affirmed, that the holyest of them all comes short of* Novatus, Donatus, *and other* ancient Hereticks, *or of* Tertullian; *when he was a* Montanist. *We only ask of them, where those Saints are to be found, of which they brag so much, if they be neither* their Clergy, *nor* their Popes? *They will answer,*

anſwer, *they mean* thoſe perſons canonized by the Pope, and placed in their Calander. *But we reply, they cheat egregiouſly; firſt, it is reported of a certain mad-man in* Athens, *who imagined*, that all the Ships which came into the Harbour were his own; *ſo they, when they hear of any promiſes made to the Church, they imagine*, they are all made to the modern Church of *Rome, and when they hear of any* Saints *and* Martyrs, *they believe, they* all profeſſed the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome. In reaſon they can brag of no Saints, but thoſe who lived after the beginning of the ſeventh Century, the Saints of the firſt ſix Centuries were not of their Church at all: for, it ſhall be proved*, part 4. lib. 2. *that the Saints, Fathers and Martyrs of the firſt ſix Centuries condemn all the Tenets of the Church of* Rome, (*of any moment which they hold contrary to Proteſtants*) *as heretical*, and are in right down terms Proteſtants: *yea, it ſhall be proved, by teſtimonies of their own Doctors, that many of theſe moſt eminent Saints*, died excommunicated by the Church of *Rome*, for reſiſting the pride of that Church; *as Saint* Polycarpus, *and all the Biſhops of* Aſia *in the time of* Victor, anno, 195. *Saint* Cyprian, *and all the Churches of* Africk *in the time of* Stephanus *Biſhop of* Rome, *about* anno, 256. *Saint* Aurelius *and Saint* Auguſtine, *and all the Biſhops of* Africk, *in the times of* Sozimus, Boniſacius *and* Celeſtinus *Biſhops of* Rome, *in the beginning of the fifth Age.*

Secondly, as for thoſe Saints, ſince the beginning of the ſeventh Century, it is anſwered firſt, that albeit the Clergy of Rome call them Saints, yet they thought the ſaid Clergy no Saints; *ſuch as Saint* Bernard *and others, who moſt bitterly inveigh againſt the corruption of the Roman Church; Saint* Bernard *expreſly calls* Rome *a* den of theeves, *and* Babylon, *mentioned by* John *in the* Apocalyps. 2. *How many of theſe modern Saints have been proved cheats? It ſhall be proved, by teſtimonies of their own Doctors*, part 3. lib. 2. *that the Pope hath* no power to canonize

nonize Saints, and that the moſt part of their Saints are vile Impoſtors, deviſed by Prieſts to cheat the ignorant people of their money, *and to* make them offer oblations at their ſhrines. *It were prolix in this Preface to inſert the particulars, but that* Impoſtur *of Saints, in many examples, ſhall be made unanſwerably appear*, part 4. lib. 2. *And this much of* Saints, *the ſeventh mark of the* Roman Church.

The laſt mark is Miracles; *the Scripture informs us, that* Antichriſt ſhall deceive all the world by falſe miracles: *It ſhall be proved likewayes*, part 4. lib. 2. *by the teſtimony of the moſt learned Popiſh Doctors, that* Miracles are no true marks of the true Church in theſe laſt times, but rather marks of the Antichriſtian Church. 2. *It ſhall be proved by the teſtimonies of the ſame men*, that moſt of the late miracles pretended by the Church of *Rome*, and the moſt notable ones, are meer Impoſturs, *which we ſhall inſtance in the forementioned place. And whereas they object, we have no miracles in our Church, it is falſe, our Doctrine was confirmed, by the miracles performed, by Chriſt and his Apoſtles; neither need we any other miracles, ſince we profeſs the ſame Doctrine. And this much of thoſe marks of the true Church, pretended by* the Mannual of Controverſies *to prove*, that the Church of *Rome* was ſuch; *to refute which, is my firſt ſcope and intention in this following Diſput.*

The ſecond ſcope of the ſaid Manual of Controverſies *was, to perſwade the Proſelyts of this Nation*, that it was not the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, that the Pope had power to depoſe Kings, either Popiſh or Proteſtant; but only of ſome particular perſons, *whom they called* the Popes flatterers: *and therefore, my ſecond intention is to prove, that the ſaid Author is either ignorant in the Principles of his own Religion, or elſe he is like Father* Cotton *the Jeſuit, who being demanded, if he believed the Pope had power to depoſe Kings? anſwered*, He did not believe it in *France*, but if he were at *Rome* he would.

That

That this King-depoſing doctrine, is the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome, is proved by three reaſons, which will puzle the ſaid Author very ſore to anſwer.*

The firſt is this, innumerable Books are printed, aſſerting ſo much (the names of the Authors ſhall be cited afterwards) ſome of which Books are dedicated to Cardinals, ſome to the Pope himſelf; but thoſe Books are authorized (by thoſe who have authority from the Pope to peruſe Books before they go to the Preſs) with an Imprimatur and a Declaration, that they contain nothing contrary to the Catholick Doctrine: *But, who but a mad man, or an Impoſtor, will affirm,* that any Doctrine conform to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome,* is not the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome? This is the Doctrine of the Church of the whole Canoniſts, unanimouſly maintained by them, and moſt of the Theologues,* viz. that the Pope has direct power in Temporals, or is direct Monarch of the whole world. *Some Theologues indeed, as* Bellarmine *and others, maintain,* that the power of the Pope is only indirect, in ordine ad ſpiritualia; *as when a King is an Heretick, or otherwayes encroacheth upon the Liberties of the Church; or when he aſſumes any thing to himſelf which the Pope ſayes belongs to him: but this Doctrine is exſibilated now at* Rome, *as* heretical; *and* Bellarmine *himſelf is taxed by* Carerius *of hereſie, for maintaining,* that the Pope hath no direct power in temporals. *Yea,* Sixtus *5th. with much ado, was hindered* from burning theſe Books of *Bellarmine* de pontifice Romano, *for denying* that direct power of the Pope in temporals; *albeit* Bellarmine *in the ſaid Books gives power to the Pope* indirectly, or in order to ſpirituals, to depoſe Kings, to abſolve their Subjects from all fidelity to them, *and that* their Subjects are oblieged at the Popes command, to riſe up in Arms againſt them, *and conſequently to kill them: but* Bellarmines *opinion is now thought too little, of the Popes power; all the Theologues now, are for the* direct dominion

nion of the Pope in temporals. *And this much of the first reason, proving, that this* King-deposing Doctrine is the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome.*

The second reason is this, That is the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome,* what is asserted by the Pope in *Cathedra*, or teaching the whole Church: but the Pope in *Cathedra*, assumes that power of deposing of Kings unto himself, *as appears by his Bulls*; *as that of* Gregory *the seventh*, *against* Henry *the fourth Emperor*; *that of* Alexander *the third*, *against the Emror* Frederick: *that of* Bonifacius *the eighth*, *against* Philip *King of* France: *that of* Paulus *the third*, *against* Henry *the eighth King of* England: *that of* Paulus *the fourth*, *against* Queen Elizabeth: *that of* Sixtus *the fifth*, *against* Henry *the third and* Henry *the fourth Kings of* France; *in which Bulls they expresly affirm*, that Kings reign by them, and that power is given them from God to establish, plant, build, root out, cast down, transfer Kingdoms at their pleasure. *The tenors of those Bulls,* (*too prolix to be inserted here*) *shall be particularly mentioned and set down*, part 4. lib. 1. *And this much of the second reason, that it is the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, that the *Pope has power to depose Kings.*

The third reason is this; *the Popes have procured that power to be conferred on them, by general Councils: as in the Council of* Lateran, *under* Innocent *third*; *the Act of which Council, is found in* Bzovius, anno, 1215. *parag.* 3. *and also in* Binius *and* Crab, *in* their Collection of Councils. *It is found likewayes in* Baronius ad annum, 1102. *numb.* 1,2,3. *and also* ad annum, 1116. *numb.* 5. *and also* ad annum, 1119. *Likewayes in the Council of* Trent, Sess. 25. Canon. 19. *It is ordained, that the Popes have power to depose any* Dominum fundi, or Proprietar of any Land where a Duel is fought; *in which Canon*, *power of deposing Kings* tacitly, and consequentially is attributed to the Pope. *The Council thought it not fit,*

in

in expreſs terms, to affirm, that the Pope had power to deprive a King of his property in that caſe; *and therefore, they made the Canon in* general termes, *comprehending* a King *under* Dominus fundi, *or* Proprietar *in general. That this is the true meaning of that Canon, appears, becauſe by reaſon of it mainly, the Kingdom of* France *did not acknowledge the Council of* Trent. *And thus we have proved, by three unanſwerable reaſons, that it is the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, that the Pope hath power to depoſe Kings; *to which may be added a fourth, which is this, which is ſo evident, that it takes away all doubt.*

The Pope hath innumerable times put that power in practice: *the firſt Pope we read attempted it, was Pope* Conſtantine *againſt* Philippicus *Emperor of* Conſtantinople, *becauſe the ſaid* Philippicus *cauſed pull down the Images of the Fathers of the ſixth general Council,* (*commonly called* Trullanum) *which were placed in the Temple of* St. Sophia: *but Pope* Conſtantine *did only bark, his Succeſſors* Gregory 2*d. and* Gregory 3*d. did bite, for the ſame reaſon of the Images,* ſtirring up the Lombards againſt the Emperor, *and bereaved them of the Exarchat of* Ravenna; *in which broils, the Emperors Governour at* Rome *being killed, the Biſhops of* Rome *got the Dutchy of* Rome *to themſelves: and when the Lombards* (*as we ſaid before*) *demanded that Tribute of them which they were accuſtomed to pay, for theſe Territories, to the Emperors of* Conſtantinople; *they called in the French, againſt the Lombards, and in recompence of their ſervices, authorized their General* Pipin, *King of* France, (*ſhutting up the righteous King, the laſt of the race of the* Merovingians, *in a Monaſtery*) *and afterwards they made* Carolus Magnus, *Son of the ſaid* Pipin, *Emperor of the Weſt; which* Carolus Magnus *made appear, that although he loved the treaſon of thoſe Biſhops of* Rome *to their* Maſters, Liege-Lords, Benefactors *and* Creators, the Emperors of *Conſtantinople,*

(by whoſe procurement they were made Univerſal Biſhops) yet he hated the Traitors, as we ſhewed before, making them his Vaſſals, both in Spirituals and Temporals, leſt they ſhould play ſuch tricks to him and his Succeſſors, as they had done to the Emperors of Conſtantinople.

We read no more of the temporal uſurpations *of the Biſhop of* Rome, *before* Gregory *7th. when (the race of* Carolus Magnus *being extinct) the Empire was tranſlated to the Germans. What extremities the ſaid* Gregory *7th. did put the Emperour* Henry *4th. to, is notorious. In ſum, he was forced to reſign the Empire to his Son* Henry *5th. (the Imperial Ornaments being violently plucked from him by the Biſhops of* Mentz *and* Culen, *his own Creatures) which Son of his agreed little better with* Paſchalis *Biſhop of* Rome: *after which time, it was the continual practices of the Biſhops of* Rome, to depoſe Kings and Emperors, and to ſtir up their Subjects to Rebellion againſt them; *as appears by thoſe paſſages of* Alexander, 3. *with the Emperor* Frederick; *of* Boniface *8th. with* Philip. le Bell, *King of* France: *of* Julius 2. *with the King of* Navarre: *of* Sixtus *5th. with* Henry 3. *and* 4. *Kings of* France: *of* Paul 3. *with* Henry 8. *and* Paul 4 *with Queen* Elizabeth *of* England. *The Stories of theſe two* Henries *of* France *is moſt lamentable.*

And thus we have proved, that it is both the Doctrine and the Practice of the Church of Rome, *that the Biſhop of* Rome *hath power* to depoſe Kings, to abſolve their Subjects from fidelity towards them, to compell them to Arms againſt them, and conſequently to kill them, and to acknowledge any for their lawful Prince, whom the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhall appoint: *How this power of the Popes can conſiſt with Kingly Government, let the Kings of the earth themſelves conſider. They make one objection yet, that it is not the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, that the Pope hath power to depoſe Kings. *By the anſwer of which*

which objection will appear, that encreaſe of Popery in a Proteſtant State, tends to the utter deſtruction both of King and Subject, and inconſiſtent with both. The objection is this.

It is not the Doctrine of the Church of France, *ſay they, that the* Pope *has power to depoſe Kings, being rejected both by its Doctrine, and by its Practice; ſince many of the Clergy of* France, *hath writen againſt that Doctrine, and* Books *defending that Opinion, (ſuch as that of* Mariana *the Spaniſh Jeſuit, and others) have been burnt by publick Authority.*

But this objection is anſwered by a twofold diſtinction; firſt of Times, *ſecondly of* Cauſes *wherefore Kings ought to be depoſed? As for* Times *when the Kings of* France *are* low, *or* high, *in the laſt caſe, the* Clergy *of* France, *ever partied their King againſt the Pope, excommunicating them, and depoſing them: as appears, by the paſſages of* Philip le Bell, *with* Ponifacius; *and of* Lewis 12*th. with* Julius *ſecond Biſhop of* Rome. *In the firſt Caſe, when the Kings of* France *are low, the* Clergy *of* France, *ever partied the* Pope, *excommunicating and depoſing their Kings; as appears, by the paſſages of* Henry 3*d. and* 4*th. Kings of* France, *with* Sixtus 5*th. Biſhop of* Rome. *It is notorious, that the Univerſity of* Paris, *confirmed by a decree, the Bulls of the ſaid* Sixtus 5*th. againſt the ſaid two* Henries *Kings of* France; *in which Bulls they were declared* uncapable of the Crown of *France*, all French men were abſolved from alledgeance to them, *and the greateſt part of* France *roſe up in armes againſt them, to dethrone them, beging of the* Pope, *that he would name them a King, and they would acknowledge him for their lawful* Prince. *And this much of the diſtinction of Times.*

The ſecond diſtinction is of Cauſes, *wherefore Kings ſhould be depoſed? although in other cauſes (beſides Hereſie) the Subjects of* France *were not ſo unanimous for the Pope againſt their*

King; yet in case of Heresie, that is, if their King were a Protestant, both the Clergy and the Laity of France, *unanimously at the Popes command, renunced alledgeance to their King: And first for the Clergy, in an Assembly of States or Parliament, Cardinal* Perron, *their Speaker commissionat from them as their mouth, in an Oration to the third Estate, affirmed,* That it had ever been the Doctrine of the Clergy of *France*, that true French men ought no alledgeance to heretical Kings, excommunicated and deposed by the Pope. *As for the Laity, it is notorious, that after the murther of* Henry 3. *they threatned to abandon* Henry 4th *his Successor, because* he was excommunicated and deposed by the Pope; *which forced him (expecting no security otherwayes) to change his Religion.*

And thus we have proved, that it is the unanimous Doctrine of the Church of Rome, that Popish Subjects owe no fidelity to a Protestant King; *which occasioned that saying of that incomparable Bishop* Mortoun, *viz.* That a loyal popish Subject in a Protestant State, was a white Ethiopian: *which I do not mention, calling in question the Loyalty of the Romanists of this Nation, or the neighbour Nations of* England *and* Ireland; *many of them* are known to be persons of Honour, and as loyal Subjects as the King hath: *I only mention those things, to let them see how they are abused by the Popish Emissaries of these three Nations, who knowing them* to be loyal Subjects to the King, *seing it would be a great difficulty to train them in their snares, and keep them in them once catched, if they told them all the verity. To train them on, they make them believe in the beginning,* that it is not the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome,* that the Pope hath power to depose Protestant Kings, (much less others) but only a calumny of Protestants, traducing the Popish Religion: *but afterwards, having by degrees confirmed them in the Popish Religion, they would not fail to perswade them,* to cut the throats of all their Countrey-men, and

flee

flee like ſo many mad-dogs upon the Kings face, to pull him from his Throne; *as appears by the conſtant practice of the Church of* Rome *againſt all Proteſtants in general, and againſt Proteſtant Kings in particular: which practice is ſo notorious, that he who denyes it, is either a mad man, void of common ſenſe, or elſe a notorious Impoſtor.*

And firſt, that it is the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, affirming it meritorious, to deſtroy Proteſtants by open cruelty and perfidy: *appears by the conſtant carriage of the ſaid Church towards Proteſtants, ſince the Reformation: What ſort of cruelty or perfidy have they not attempted? Death without torture was thought clemency; burning of them in heaps alive in houſes, might be attributed to a popular fury, but it is notorious, that multitudes of them were burnt alive in fires, of all Sexes and Qualities, by the ſentences of the Judges; and when they could do no good by open force, they deſtroyed them* by perfidy, and proſtitution of the publick Faith, *and when they had done, made publick Proceſſions of Joy, Bonefires, and ſuch like, as if they had deſerved Paradiſe by ſuch meritorious works; maintaining this* maxime *as unqueſtionable,* that no publick Faith ſhould be regarded or obſerved towards Hereticks. *That this is truth, appears by the proceedings of the Council of* Conſtance, *with* John Huſſe, *and* Hierom *of* Prague, *which two were burned alive, notwithſtanding they had the ſafe conduct of the Emperor* Sigiſmundus. *It appears alſo, by thoſe maſſacres of* Paris, *and other parts of* France, *where, by the publick Faith, they trained them all to one place, and then perfidiouſly maſſacred them, to the horror of ſeveral learned Romaniſts, who in their Hiſtories, deteſt ſuch perfidy, ſuch as* Thuanus *and others: and when they had done,* tanquam re bene geſta triumpharunt, *they were congratulated by the Pope, who cauſed Bonefires and publick Proceſſions to be made at* Rome, *for the happy ſucceſs of ſuch a glorious atchievment.*

Theſe

These things are notorious, so that the Popish emissaries *themselves, have neither the brow to deny them, nor the confidence to defend them: But they use another shift,* viz. That the Church of *Rome* hath given over that practice now, being resolved no more to follow those courses, as they did in the beginning, *prompted to them, by their too violent zeal.*

But it is answered, they are greatly mistaken, for now in France, *and* Germany, *and other places, they practise not such cruelties, because they dare not, but where they have power, and thinks they may do it without any hazard; they make it appear, that they believe, it is a meritorious work, to destroy and extirpat all Protestants, by any cruelty, or perfidy imaginable: as appears of late, not only abroad, by the proceeding of the Duke of* Savoy, *at the Popes* Instigation, *against these of the Vallies of* Piemont, *by which innumerable persons, were destroyed by such cruelty and perfidy, as the like hath not been recorded in any History, which are dicribed at large, in a great Volum, published by an eye witnesse of them:* But *also at home; what cruelties were exercised in* Ireland, *none needs to be informed? And this much of the Inclinations of the Church of* Rome, *to* Protestants *in general.*

What good-will they have to Protestant Kings, they are blind who sees not? All Protestants *are excommunicate at their Jubilees; but it is a meritorious work, to kill an excommunicated person, though he be a King; when* Henry *the 3d. and* Henry *the 4th. Kings of* France, *were excommunicated by the Pope* Sixtus *5th. the first of them was murthered by a Monk, for which, Bonefires were made in* Paris, (*that of the Popes* Nuntio *being so great, that it endangered the neighbours houses*) *mutual congratulations passed between those of the League, and the Consistory at* Rome. Pope Sixtus *the 5th.*

triumphes

triumphs in the Conſiſtory ; as appears by his ſpeech publiſhed by the means of Mr. Warmingtoun, Chaplian to Cardinal *Allen* an Engliſh Cardinal. *The friends and relations of the murtherer of the King , are enriched by contributions, the Effigy of the Aſſaſſin was carried in proceſſions , and with much ado , his* Canonization for a Saint *was ſtopped at* Rome ; *that is , many ſtrove to have him enrolled , as a deſerving perſon , that he might be after Canonized in due time : Who ſeeth not , that all this was done ,* to encourage all to kill any King excommunicated and depoſed by the Pope ; *and in particular ,* Henry 4th. King of *France ,* ſucceſſor to *Henry 3d. Neither did the event , deceive their expectation , for a little after , one* Chaſtel *intending to murther him , wounded him in his own Chamber in the mouth , there being none in the Room beſide , but onely an other Nobleman ; which he performed ſo ſubtilly , that neither the King , nor the Nobleman perceived him in the Action : till at laſt the Noble man , for his own vindication , catched him by the arm , affirming ,* that either he or himſelf had wounded the King , and it was fit, they were both arreſted , till it were known , which of them two it was ? *There were other innumerable attempts of aſſaſſines prompt in by the Jeſuits , upon the life of the ſaid* Henry 4th. *which were ſo thick , that they could not all miſcarry , and ſo at laſt , hewas ſtobbed in the heart in his Coach by* Ravillac. *That this was not unpleaſant to the Pope , appears , becauſe a little after ,* the arreſt of the Parliament of *Paris* againſt *Chaſtel* (who attempting to murther the King, wounded him) was publickly cenſured at *Rome* , as unjuſt.

And this much of France ; *we have many examples at home, that the Bigots of the Popiſh Religion, think it a meritorious work, (encouraged by their Confeſſors) to attempt upon the lives of* Proteſtant Princes , *excommunicated and depoſed by the* Pope : *We have many inſtances in Queen* Elizabeth , *who all her life-*

time

time was vexed by the doubled and re-doubled attempts to murder her; and when the malefactors were apprehended, they were ſo far from acknowledging their fault, that they gloried in it, profeſſing it was no ſin, but meritorious, to kill an excommunicated Tyrant, neither were they obliged to acknowledge, for their lawful Prince, thoſe who were excommunicated by the Pope. *King* James *alſo was very near having a ſhare in thoſe popiſh Practices, in* the Powder-plot, *if it had not been diſcovered by a miraculous providence:* Valentia *and other Jeſuits abroad, were not aſhamed (tacitly and conſequentially) to defend it; that is, they maintained openly in their Writings,* that thoſe who violat the Oath of Supremacy and Alledgeance, were not perjured, becauſe that Oath was never obligatory. *Our preſent Emiſſaries perſwades their Proſelyts, that the ſaid Powder-plot was but a fiction, deviſed by Secretary* Cecil, *to make the popiſh Religion odious; by which it appears, of what mettal thoſe men are. And this much of my ſecond ſcope,* viz. *to prove in this work, that it was the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, that the Pope had power to depoſe Kings, and popiſh Subjects ought no alledgeance to a Proteſtant Prince; *and that encreaſe of Popery could not conſiſt in a Proteſtant State, with the ſafety of either King or Subject: and who affirm the contrary, are either deceivers themſelves, or deceived by others.*

My Lords and Gentlemen, *I have repreſented unto your Lordſhips, the excellency of the Subject which I preſent unto you, what method I obſerve in it? what is my ſcope in it? now it remains to ſhow unto your Lordſhips, how I anſwer, as I can, to what is objected againſt me? And firſt, ſome perhaps will affirm that I am* malus Patronus bonæ Cauſæ, *or that I do not diſput this great Controverſie ſo to the purpoſe, as the importance of it requires: But I anſwer, whether I diſput well or badly, I deſerve neither the praiſe nor the blame, ſince I only diſput it as the greateſt Spirits of both ſides have done before me. When a Clerk*

minuts

minuts the diſput of Pleaders before a Judge, his part is to do it faithfully, which if he perform, he cannot in reaſon be blamed, although the reaſons hinc inde, *be never ſo weak, or not perſwaſive, otherwayes, he is guilty of forgery. I play the part of a Clerk, not of a Judge; which if I do unfaithfully, let any put me to it, either in privat or in publick, and if I do not vindicat my ſelf, I deſerve the character of* an Impoſtor. *It is true indeed, that I mention ſome teſtimonies of Fathers, which I did not ſee in the Originals; but there is not one of theſe teſtimonies, but I can inſtruct, that they are cited by popiſh Authors themſelves, or if they be not, I can inſtruct by the* Originals, *that they are falſly cited by the ſaids popiſh Authors, that is, that they are either falſly tranſlated out of the Greek (as I inſtance in ſeveral paſſages, cited by our Adverſaries from the verſions of* Chriſtopherſon *and* Trapezuntius) *or elſe they are mutilated, that is,* telling that part of the Tale which makes for them, and ſuppreſſing that which makes againſt them: *or elſe they are forged, and that the Fathers affirm no ſuch thing as they pretend. Of their mutilating of teſtimonies, I will only inſtance two particulars, or three at moſt: The firſt is,* Ambroſius *affirms,* We uſe to follow the Church of *Rome* in all things; Bellarmine *with great pomp concludes, that from theſe words,* Ambroſius aſſerts neceſſar communion with the Church of *Rome: but he forgets to tell, what* Ambroſius *ſayes immediatly after,* viz. quia tamen nos homines ſumus ſi quid alibi rectius, hoc obſervamus; *that is,* albeit we uſe to follow the Church of *Rome* (it being the prime Church) yet, if elſewhere we find any thing more Orthodox, ſince we are men endued with reaſon, we uſe to follow that. *The truth is,* Ambroſius *in that place is expreſly diſputing againſt* neceſſar communion with the Church of *Rome,* (*as ſhall appear* part 2. lib. 1.) *concerning a certain ceremony in Baptiſm. Likewayes,* Gregorius Magnus *is cited by* Bellarmine, *to prove that* Peter *was ordained Monarch*

of the Church, becauſe he affirms, that the care of the whole Church was committed to him; *in which he playes the ſophiſter egregiouſly, ſuppreſſing what immediatly followeth*, viz. Petrus tamen non erat univerſalis Apoſtolus, *Peter* was not univerſal Apoſtle nevertheleſs. *The truth is*, Gregorius *is expreſly diſputing in that paſſage, againſt any Monarch of the Church, calling that Title* ſacrilegious and blaſphemous; *and amongſt other reaſons, he hath this for one*, if any had reaſon to be called Monarch of the Church or œcumenick Biſhop, it was *Peter*, becauſe the care of the whole Church was committed to him; but notwithſtanding of that, he was not œcumenick Biſhop, or univerſal Biſhop, or Apoſtle. *Your Lordſhips will find many inſtances of that kind, diſperſed through the following Treatiſe, and alſo their* falſe tranſlations: *yea, they do not produce one teſtimony* (except either of Biſhops of *Rome*, or their flatterers, *which ſort of teſtimonies are rejected by* Æneas Silvius, *afterwards Pope himſelf, as meriting no credit*) *but either it is mutilated in the foreſaid manner, or falſly* tranſlated *or* forged.

It may be objected ſecondly againſt me, that my Stile is rude; But I anſwer, a key of Iron, if it open the door with facility, is to be preferred to one of Gold, which doth it with difficulty. *The Diſcourſe for the moſt part is* Dogmatick, *in which Rhetorick is rather hurtful then profitable; the ſtrained Rhetorick of the Fathers hath ſet us all by the ears together. Moſt of the ſhelter which our Adverſaries have in the Writings of the Fathers*, is in their too high ſtrained Allegories, *as will be proved by an induction of all thoſe Controverſies we have with the Church of* Rome. *We will give an inſtance or two in this Preface, of which your Lordſhips will find innumerable, diſperſed through the whole Diſput, eſpecially* part 4. lib. 2. *where* the newneſs of the preſent popiſh Religion is expreſly diſputed.

Firſt,

First, *to prove neceſſar communion with the Church of* Rome, *or the infallibility of the particular Church of* Rome, Bellarmine *cites* Cyprian, *affirming*, that Perfidy can have no acceſſe to that Church: *which expreſſion of his, is found in an Epiſtle of his, written to* Cornelius *biſhop of* Rome. *That this is onely* Rhetorick, *and a* Complement, *appears by innumerable other Epiſtles of* Cyprian; *in which he taxeth* Stephanus *Biſhop of* Rome, *and the particular Church of* Rome, *of* Ignorance, Arrogancy, *and* Patronizing of Hereticks; *yea it is notorious, and confeſſed by our Adverſaries, that he died out of communion with the Church of* Rome; *and yet (as we ſaid) he is a Saint in the Roman Callander.*

Secondly, Bellarmine *and others, produce many teſtimonies of the Fathers, to prove the Supremacy of* Peter, *becauſe they call him* Head and Prince of the Apoſtles, *that this is only Rhetorick, is notorious, for two reaſons: firſt, it ſhall be proved, that theſe very Fathers expreſly affirm, and prove,* that Peter had no Supremacy over the Church, or other Apoſtles: *but that all the Apoſtles were* of alike Fellowſhip, Dignity, and Power with him. 2. *Becauſe theſe very Fathers, complement others alſo, with the ſame title* of Head and Prince, *as they do* Paul *and* James; *yea*, Chryſoſtom (*then whom none calls* Peter *oftner* Head and Prince) *expreſly affirms*, Paul was in every thing equal to Peter; *and when he had ſo ſayed, he adds*, nedicam amplius; *which is as much as to ſay, that in his opinion*, Paul was to be preferred to Peter. 3. *To prove* Tranſubſtantiation, *they bring many teſtimonies of the Fathers, ſuch as theſe*, This Bread which you ſee, is not common Bread, but the Fleſh of Chriſt; this Wine which you ſee, is not ordinar Wine, but the Blood of Chriſt; *that theſe expreſſions are onely* ſtrained Allegories, *appears, by the teſtimonies of the ſame Fa-*

thers, especially of Ambrosius, *who speaking* of the Water in Baptism, *useth the same phrase of speaking*, viz. that Water which ye behold, is not ordinar Water, but the Blood of Christ; *but our Adversaries do not affirm, that the Water in Baptism is* transubstantiat into the blood of Christ. *Another reason is unanswerable, that those expressions are only* Allegories, *viz. Those very Fathers, especially* Ambrosius, *expressly affirm, that after the consecration,* the Bread keeps still the nature of Bread, and the Wine of Wine; *many of which expressions are now taken out by the* Indices expurgatorii, *in all the new printed Copies of the Fathers, by the Popes authority, contrary to the Faith, not only of all the* old Manuscripts, *but also of the* printed Copies, *before* anno, 1564. *at which time, that famous Printer* Manutius *gelded all the Fathers, (which he doth not dissemble himself) at the command of* Paulus 4*th. Bishop of* Rome.

My Lords and Gentlemen, *Thus I have represented unto you, the excellency of the Subject of which I treat; 2. What method I observe in it? 3. What is my scope in it? 4. How I answer, as I can, all what is objected against me? If any have more to object, I intreat them to put me to it, and if I cannot convince them by an Apology, I shall ingenuously confess my fault, either in privat or in publick. No more, but wishing every one of you in your stations, to be serviceable to God, your King and Country, and steadable to your own Families and Relations; I rest according to my power, ready to do you service,*

SAMUEL COLVIL.

THE GRAND IMPOSTOR DISCOVERED: OR AN *HISTORICALL DISPUT* OF THE Papacy and Popiſh Religion.

PART I. BOOK I.

Of the Biſhoprick of Peter.

CHAP. I.

That the cheat of the Modern Roman Faith is diſcovered by theſe three Paſſages of Scripture, By which they endeavor to prove the Inſtitution of Peters *Monarchy.*

IT was proved in the Preface, that the truth or falſhood of the Modern Roman Faith depended upon that of the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome:* which is the true reaſon, why the braveſt ſpirits of both ſides ruſh together with ſuch animoſity in this conteſt: the one to aſſert it, the other to aſſault it: both parties pretending Scripture, Reaſon, Councils, Fa-

thers; and each party upbraiding other with wresting of Scripture, Sophistry, perverting, and forging testimonies of Antiquity. When I considered these high and mutual reflections of those not only learned, but pious men of both sides (as cannot be denyed) curiosity moved me to study the Contest, that I might perceive (if I could) which Party was to blame: and when I had so done, I resolved to minut the Disput, as a Clerk doth those pleadings before a Judge; omitting *Grammaticisms*, *Criticisms*, and *Rhetorical digressions*, I only mention the most substantial Arguments, and answers, *Hinc inde*; doing what I could for the benefit of Persons of Honor of both Religions, (to whom I am many ways ingaged) whose condition, and abilities or leasure requires rather to catch the *Partridge* in the nest in a compendious Treatise, then to hunt her in the Woods, Fields, and Mountains of vast and volumnious *Authors*, though never so learned. If any affirm that I play not the *Clerk* faithfully in minuting this Disput, let him put me to it, either in privat, or publick: and if I do not vindicate my self, let me be esteemed an *Impostor* and infamous for forgery: and lest any think I cheat in citations, I am able to justify, that I make use of no passages, but those which are acknowledged by both sides: where the Disput is, about the true meaning of the words, and (which not seldom falls out) whether the testimony be forged or not?

The whole Disput consists in the examination of those three Questions.

1. Whether the Apostle *Peter* was ordained by our *Savior Visible Head* of the *Church* under himself, or subordinat *Monarch* of the Church?

2. If at the command of Christ, the said Apostle *Peter* fixed the seat of his particular *Bishoprick* at *Rome*?

3. If the Bishop of *Rome* by Divine institution succeeds to *Peter*, in the *Monarchy* of the Church?

I.

If the affirmitives of thoſe three queſtions be true, without all queſtion, *Communion with the Church of Rome is neceſſar unto Salvation, and the Religion of* Proteſtants *is a new ſprung-up Hereſie*: But if any one of thoſe three *Affirmatives* be falſe (much more all three) it is as certain, that the Faith of the *Modern Roman Church* is an idolatrous and heretical novelty: none can ſucceed to *Peter* in the *Monarchy* of the Church, if *Peter* was not himſelf *Monarch of the Church*: Neither can the *Biſhop of Rome* ſucceed to *Peter* in the *Monarchy* of the Church, albeit *Peter* were *Monarch* of the Church himſelf, except *Peter* were alſo *Biſhop of Rome*. Again, albeit *Peter* had been both *Monarch of the Church*, and *Biſhop of Rome*, it doth not follow that the *Biſhop of Rome* ſucceeded to *Peter* by Divine inſtitution in the *Monarchy* of the Church; unleſs it be made out otherwiſe by Scripture, or unqueſtionable Antiquity. *Calvin, lib. 4. Inſt. cap. 6. num. 8.* rightly obſerves, that *Peter* might have had ſome extraordinary priviledge in his own perſon, to which none ſucceeded after him.

The firſt two queſtions, or *Biſhoprick of Peter* are diſputed in this firſt Book, the third queſtion in the following Books.

The *Monarchy* of *Peter*, or his univerſal *Biſhoprick* is diſputed unto *chap.* 22. his particular *Biſhoprick* of *Rome*, from thence to the end. His *Monarchy* is diſputed three ways. Firſt, from his inſtitution, unto *chap.* 15. Secondly, from his prerogatives and carriage, unto *chap.* 19: Thirdly, by teſtimonies of Fathers, from thence to *chap.* 22.

His inſtitution again is aſſerted unto *chap.* 11. and aſſaulted from thence unto *chap.* 15. His inſtitution is aſſerted by three teſtimonies of Scripture and aſſaulted by as many. The three teſtimonies by which it is aſſerted; are firſt, *Mat.* 16. 18. *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church.* The ſecond is, *Matthew* 16. 19. *And I will give unto thee the keys of the*

Kingdom of Heaven; and whatſoever thou ſhalt bind upon Earth ſhal be bound in Heaven: and whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe upon Earth, ſhal be looſed in Heaven. The third paſſage is, *John* 21. 15, 16, 17. *Feed my Lambs, Feed my Sheep.* Thoſe three teſtimonies are the main Foundation of the faith of the *Roman Church.* If *Peter* be not ordained Monarch of the Church in thoſe three teſtimonies, he is ordained Monarch of the Church no where: and if he be ordained Monarch of the Church no where, the Biſhop of *Rome* did not ſucceed to him in the Monarchy of the Church: and if the Biſhop of *Rome* did not ſucceed to him in the Monarchy of the Church, the faith of the *Modern Roman Church* is a cheat, communion with it is ſo far from being neceſſar unto Salvation, that Salvation cannot conſiſt with it (we ſpeak not of Gods ſecret providence) ordinarily. This ſort of reaſoning is approved by *Bellarmin* himſelf in the preface of his diſput *de Pont. Rom.* where he calls that controverſie of the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, a debate *de ſummâ rei Chriſtianæ*; that is, whether Chriſtianity can ſubſiſt or not? By *Chriſtianity*, or *Chriſtian Faith*, or *Chriſtian Religion*, no queſtion he means the doctrin of the Modern Church of *Rome*: and ſince in that expreſſion he grants, that it cannot ſubſiſt without the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, he muſt of neceſſity grant, that the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome* (having no ground in Scripture or Antiquity) the Doctrine of the Modern Church of *Rome* is warrantable by neither: which is further confirmed, becauſe in the ſame place he affirms, that the Chriſtian Faith without the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, *Is like a houſe without a foundation, a body without a head, Moon-ſhine without the Sun*: which is as much to ſay, as without the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, the doctirne of the Modern Church of *Rome*, is nothing at all; ſince it is notorious that a houſe without a foundation, a body without a head, Moon-light without the Sun, are things impoſſible.

Since

Since it is ſo then, if the Ancients, Fathers and Councils did not believe that *Peter* was ordained Monarch of the Church in thoſe three fore-mentioned paſſages of Scripture; queſtionleſs they did not believe the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and if they did not believe the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, it followeth of neceſſity that they did not believe any neceſſar communion with the Church of *Rome*, notwitſtanding all the braggings of our adverſaries to the contrair, boaſting that the whole current of Antiquity is for them. Whether their aſſertion be true or nor, will appear by the following enquiry: *viz.* What were the opinions of the Ancients concerning thoſe three paſſages of Scripture pretended by our adverſaries for the inſtitution of *Peters* Monarchy? By which enquiry will appear alſo by infallible conſequence, what opinion the Ancients had of neceſſar communion with the Church of *Rome*? So it may be affirmed that the examination of thoſe three paſſages is a compendious diſput of the whole controverſies, which we have with the Church of *Rome*.

CHAP. II.

Tues Petrus, *Diſputed by Scripture and Reaſon.*

THe firſt paſſage then, proving the inſtitution of *Peter* to be Monarch of the Church, is from *Mat.* 16. 18. *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church.* This is the place in which our Adverſaries have moſt confidence. It may be ſafely ſaid, that if *Peter* be not ordained Monarch of the Church in thoſe words, he is no where elſe. If any would yet have a more compendious Diſput of the controverſies, it is to be found in this paſſage alone: For if in the opinion of Antiquity, *Peter* was not ordained Monarch of the Church, or promiſed to be ordained Monarch of the Church in this paſſage; queſtionleſs, they neither believed the Supremacy

macy of *Peter*, nor of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, nor neceſſar communion with the Church of *Rome*; ſince the laſt two (as we ſaid) depend upon the firſt: and therefore we will examine this paſſage the more acuratly. Firſt, by Scripture and Reaſon. Next, (becauſe they brag ſo much of Antiquity) by teſtimonies of Councils and Fathers. In the laſt place, (becauſe they brag ſo much of Unity) by *Popes*, and *Popiſh Doctors*. Of which in Order.

Our Adverſaries reaſon thus.

He who is the *Rock* upon which the Church is built, is *Viſible head* of the Church, or *Oecumenick Biſhop*. But *Peter* is the *Rock* or *Foundation* upon which the Church is built, as appears by the words of our Savior, *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church*. Ergo, Peter *is Oecumenick Biſhop*.

But it is anſwered: Firſt, It is falſe that the Church is built upon *Peter* as a *Rock*. Secondly, Although our Savior had called *Peter* the *Rock*, it doth not follow that he ordained him *Oecumenick Biſhop*, as ſhal be proved, *cap. 6.*

That *Peter* is not the *Rock*, we will diſput: Firſt, By *Scripture* and *Reaſon*. Secondly, by *Councils* and *Fathers*. Thirdly, by *Popes* and *Popiſh Doctors*. And firſt by Scripture, 1. *Cor.* 3. 11. *For other Foundation can no man lay, then that is laid, which is Jeſus Chriſt*: by which it appears that Chriſt is only the *Rock* upon which the Church is built, and not *Peter*.

Bellarmin anſwers, That Chriſt is only the *Primary Foundation*, but *Peter* is the *Secondary Foundation*. If this were not the meaning of *Paul*, he would contradict himſelf, *Epheſ.* 2. 20. *And are built upon the Foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief Corner-ſtone*. Where, ſaith he, ye have that diſtinction of *Primary* and *Secondary Foundations*: Chriſt is called the *Corner-ſtone*, or chief

Foundations

foundations; the Prophets and Apoſtles are *ſecondary foundations*.

But it is replyed: Firſt, That *Bellarmin* cannot apply his diſtinction of *ſecondary foundation* to *Peter* alone by this paſſage, ſince the Apoſtle expreſly affirms, That all the Prophets and Apoſtles are *Bellarmins ſecondary foundations*; and conſequently, they are all *Oecumenick Biſhops*, which *Bellarmin* will not eaſily grant.

Secondly, *Bellarmin* would have diſtinguiſhed far better foundations in *proper* and *improper*. Chriſt is properly the foundation of the Church the Prophets and Apoſtles ars *improperly*, or *metonymically foundations*; *viz.* they are called foundations, becauſe they preach Chriſt, or by reaſon of their Doctrine of Chriſt, who is the true *foundation*: So *Ambroſius*; *Primaſius*, *Anſelmus*, *Lombardus*, *Cajetanus*, *Lyranus*, and the interlinear gloſs upon 1. *Cor.* 3. 11. *Guillaudus* interprets after the ſame manner, and the great School-man *Vaſquez*, *In ſecundam ſecundæ*, *Diſput.* 210. *cap.* 7. hath theſe words, *Non Apoſtolos & Prophetas intelligit, ſed fidem illorum ab eis ſcilicet prædicatam & annunciatam*: that is, *He calls not the Prophets and Apoſtles themſelves foundations, but only the faith which they preach.* It is true that *Aquinas*, following ſome of the Fathers, interprets the Apoſtles themſelves to be *foundations*; but the meaning is all one, they mean *improper foundations*: and *Thomas* his gloſs rejected by *Vaſquez* himſelf, who comments upon him as we now ſaid.

Bellarmin objects; Secondly, *Apocalyps* 21. 14. *And the wall of the City had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apoſtles of the Lamb.* Where, ſaith he, all the twelve Apoſtles are called *foundations*.

But it is anſwered: Firſt, Although they were, yet it makes not much for *Bellarmins* purpoſe: for if all the twelve Apoſtles be *ſecondary foundations*, *Peters* being *ſecondary foundation* doth

doth not conclude him to be Oecumenick Bishop, no more then it doth the rest.

Secondly, It is false that the twelve Apostles are called foundations in that place: *John* only affirms, that the names of the twelve Apostles were written upon the foundation of that new *Jerusalem*.

Thirdly, Although both *Haimo* and *Lyranus* interpret the Apostles to be foundations, yet they give the same gloss which they gave upon 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. *viz.* Because of the Doctrine which they preach: the words of *Haimo* are, *Et in ipsis fundamentis, hoc est, in fide Patriarcharum & Apostolorum nomina duodecim Apostolorum.* The words of *Lyranus* are, *Dicuntur autem nomina Apostolorum in ipsis fundamentis scripta, quia primò publicârunt fidem Christi prædicando, & pro ipsa moriendo.* The same is the explication of *Aretas* upon this place of the *Apocalyps*, viz. *The Apostles are called foundations, because of their preaching Christ, and dying for him or the faith.*

Stapleton answers to that place of 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. some other wise then *Bellarmin*, making a distinction between ἄλλο and ἕτερον, *aliud* and *alterum*; which cannot well be expressed in English, except ye express it thus, *another* and a *different*. *Paul*, saith he, affirmeth that there is not *another* foundation but Christ; but he doth not affirm that there is not a *different* foundation from Christ: Which two he distinguisheth, because *Peter*, saith he, is not *another foundation* from Christ, differing essentially; but only *a different foundation*, that is, differing accidentally: Christ, saith he, is the principal foundation; *Peter* is the subordinat and ministerial foundation.

But this subtilty of *Stapleton* is to no purpose: First, because the *Greek* word ἄλλο *another* signifie sometime things which differ only accidentally, as *Mat.* 4. Εἶδεν ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφούς, *He saw two other Brethren*, *Mark* 3. ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ὑγιὴς ὡς ἄλλη. *His hands was made whole as the other.* Therefore its false that ἄλλο sig-

signifieth a thing different by nature; but ἕτερον, a thing differing accidentally.

Secondly, his distinction is refuted by the very text it self: for after *Paul* said, *Nemo potest aliud fundamentum ponere*, he adds, *præter id quod positum est, quod est Iesus Christus.* By which words he expressly excluds all other foundations beside Christ, whether they differ in nature, or accidentally.

Thirdly, in what sense can *Stapleton* affirm, that Christ and *Peter* are foundations in the same specifical nature, differing only in accidentals, as *Peter* and *Paul* two individuals? For Christ is properly a foundation upon which the Edifice of the Church is built: *Peter* is only a foundation, because he laid the foundation on Christ. These two foundations have nothing but the name *common*, as *Taurus* the mountain, *Taurus* the constellation, and *Taurus* a bull.

Fourthly, *Stapleton* speaks contradictions, in affirming, that a principal foundation, and a subordinat foundation have the same specifick nature, and differ only accidentally as two individuals, *v. g. Peter & Paul*: which is all one as ye would say, The power of a King, & that of his under-officer were the same; the same power in nature, differing only accidentally.

Fifthly, *Stapleton* contradicts himself in another place; for in his relections, controvers. 3. *quæst.* 1. *art.* 1. *conclus.* 3. he expressly affirms that *Peter* is *Fundamentum primarium in suo genere quale Christus est in alio genere*: which is diametrally opposit to what he affirms here. Here he affirms *Peter* is a subordinat and Ministerial foundation, there he calls him a principal foundation: here he affirms the foundation of Christ and *Peter* to be of the same nature *ejusdem speciei*; there he affirms they are of different natures, *toto genere*.

Lastly, this distinction of *Stapletons* is against all Antiquity, affirming that the meaning of the Apostle admites of no proper Foundations but Christ alone. So *Hieronymus, Theodoretus, Chry-*

Chrysostomus, Oecumenius, Lyranus, Solus Christus, vel fides ipsius, est fundamentum, Christ only, or the faith of Christ is the foundation.

And thus we have disputed by Scripture, that Christ is the only Rock or Foundation; and consequently *Peter* cannot be the Rock on which Christ promiseth to build his Church, in those words, *Tu es Petrus, &c.*

In the next place it is proved by reason, One thing cannot be signified by a name, and its denominative: *Petra*, or *the Rock*, is the name; *Petrus*, *Peter or stony*, is the denominative from that name. Ergo the *Rock* is not *Peter*.

Secondly, *Petrus* is of the masculine gender, and of the second person: *Petra*, or the *Rock*, is of the feminine gender, and third person.

Bellarmin answers, Petra and Petrus are expressed in the *Syrian* tongue, (in which our Savior spoke) by the same word *Cephas*, which removes those difficulties, since our Savior spoke those words in the *Syrian* tongue.

It is replyed, first, it is false that *Cephas*, signifying a stone or Petram, and *Cephas* signifying stony or Petrum, are the same words in the *Syrian* tongue, because *Cephas*, signifying a stone, is of the feminine gender; as appears by the *Syriack* version, 1 *Cor.* 11. *Mat.* 22. *Mark* 16.

Secondly, *Matthew* the Apostle himself questionless knew the meaning of Christ in these words, as well as *Bellarmin*, *Baronius*, *Stapleton* or *Sanderus*: but he in his Gospel expresly affirms, *Tu es* Petrus, *& super hanc* Petram *ædificabo Ecclesiam meam.* But if *Peter* had been the Rock, *Matthew* would have rendred these words of Christ, *Thou art the Rock, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.*

Here is to be observed the impudence, if not blasphemy, of *Petrus de Bollo*, a Parisian Divine in his authentick probation of the sacrifice of the Mass, having these words, *Scimus quod in-*

interpres Matthæi Syri, Græcus & Latinus, non sit hoc loco optimè de hac nostræ fidei parte promeritus. Si enim dixisset, Et tu es Petra, & super hanc Petram res fuisset multò clarior: cum Christus, qui Syriacè proculdubio loquebatur, dixerit, Tu es Petra, & super hanc Petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam: We know that the Greek and Latin Interpreter of Matthew (who wrote in the Syrian tongue) have not deserved much of our faith; for if he had rendred the words, Thou art the Rock, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, the thing had been more clear, since assuredly Christ spoke in the Syrian, Thou art the Rock, and upon this Rock I will build my Church. Where he expresly affirms, that *Matthew* the Evangelist (or at least his *Greek* Interpreter, since it is thought by some, that the Gospel of *Matthew* was written originally in *Syriack*) translats the word of Christ unfaithfully thus, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church: whereas he should have translated them, Thou art the Rock, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.* In affirming which, he speaks right-down blasphemy, if *Matthew* penned his Gospel in *Greek* himself: and although that translation were not of *Matthew* himself, but of some other nevertheless he condemns the whole primitive Church, and the ancient Church of *Rome* among the rest, for approving as authentick, a false interpretation in so substantial a point. That the *Greek* vetsion *Matthews* Gospel was held authentick by the Primitive Church, shal be demonstrated, *lib. 6.*

The third reason why *Peter* cannot be the Rock, is this, The foundation, or rock upon which the Church militant and the Church triumphant are built, are both one: & consequently *Peter* would be the foundation of the Church triumphant, if he were the Rock upon which the Church is built. And since the Bishop of *Rome* succeeds to *Peter*, as they all averr, the Bishop of *Rome* is the foundation of the Church triumphant: which assertion is so absurd, that no Christian ears can hear it without detestation.

Finally, if *Peter* be the Rock upon which the Church is built, it would follow that *Peter* was Oecumenick Bishop, when Christ said unto him, *Tu es Petrus*: The meaning of Christ, say they, is, *Tu es Petrus*, or *thou art the Rock*: and consequently thou art Oecumenick Bishop presently: since our Savior doth not say unto him, *Tu eris Petra*, or *thou shalt be the Rock* or Oecumenick Bishop. But if *Peter* had been the Rock, or Oecumenick Bishop at that time, the gates of hell would have prevailed against him; which is expresly against the promise of Christ, since *Peter* after that denied Christ thrice. And thus we have disputed, *Tu es Petrus*, by reason.

Stapleton endeavors to prove by several reasons, that *Peter* is the Rock: which in effect are the same reasons, clothed with diversity of words. The sum of them is this, It appears, saith he, by all the circumstances, that some singular thing or other was given to *Peter* in those words; for *Peter* answered only, *Thou art the Son of the living God.* Secondly, Christ pronounced him blessed. Thirdly, Christ affirmed he had that secret only by revelation from God. Lastly, Christ pronounced those words to him as a reward, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.*

It is answered, It was a sufficient reward for *Peter*, that he was called *Petrus*, from *Petra*, the Rock, which was Christ. It had been too high a reward for *Peter*, to obtain that which was proper to Christ; this is the opinon of all the Fathers, as *Hilarius de Trinitate, Petrus, quia habebat societatem fidei, cum Domino habuit etiam unitatem nominis Dominici: ut sicut à Christo Christianus dicitur, ita à Petrâ Christo, Petrus Apostolus vocaretur. Peter, because he had society of faith, with the Lord he was called Peter from* Petra, *as a Christian is called after Christ. Augustinus, Sermon.* 13. *De verbis Domini secundum Matthaum. Deinde addidit, Et ego dico tibi: tanquam aiceret, Quia tu mihi dixisti, Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi, & ego dico tibi,*

Tu

Tu es Petrus; that is, Thou shalt be called *Peter*, *because of thy confessing me to be the Son of God.* Other testimonies might be heaped, but it is to no purpose.

Stapleton insists, that it was not the name only, which Peter got as a reward, but some thing beside, proper to himself, *viz.* to be the Rock, upon which the Church is built: which he proves by the authority of *Chrysostom*, whose words are cited by him thus, *Quoddam hic esse Filii donum proprium* Petro *datum, sicut* Patris *quoddam donum erat eidem concessum: Pater enim revelavit* Petro *Christum esse Filium Dei vivi; Filius tribuit* Petro *ut sit Ecclesiæ* Petra, that is, *Some proper gift was given to* Peter *here by Christ, as the Father had given unto him such a gift: the Father revealed to* Peter *that Christ was the Son of the living God; So the Son gives unto* Peter *to be the Rock of the Church.*

It is answered, *Stapleton* cites *Chrysostom* falsly; his words in the Original are, Τί ἐστί, καὶ ἐγὼ δώσω σοι? ὥσπερ πατὴρ σοι, ἔδοκε τὸ ἐμὲ γνῶσαι οὕτω καὶ ἐγώ σοι δώσω. καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, παρακαλέσω τὸν πατέρα καὶ τοὶ πολλὴ ἦν τῆς ἐξουσίας ἡ ἔνδειξις, καὶ τοῦ δώρου τὸ μέγεθος ἄφατον ἀλλ' ἐγώ σοι δώσω, τί δίδως εἴπεμοι? τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν: that is, *What is it and I will give it to thee? as the Father gave unto thee to know me, so I will give unto thee. Neither said he, I will ask of my Father, although it was a great ostentation of his power, and the greatness of the gift ineffable: Nevertheless, I will give unto thee. What wilt thou give, pray? the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.*

By which it appears that *Stapleton* plays the Sophister thrice. First in making *Chrysostom* affirm, that some proper or peculiar thing was given to *Peter*, whereas *Chrysostom* mentions no such thing at all. Secondly, he makes *Chrysostom* affirm that the gift given to *Peter* was to be the Rock upon which the Church is built; whereas *Chrysostom* saith no such thing, affirming only that the gift given to *Peter* was the Keys of the Kingdom

Kingdom of Heaven: but it shal be proved by the testimony of *Chrysostom* himself, *chap.* 8. That the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to others as well as to *Peter.* Thirdly, he neglects the comparison which *Chrysostom* makes, (leaving out now where he added before) viz. *As the Father gave unto thee to know me, so I give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of heaven,* The reason wherefore he neglects the comparison, is evident, *viz.* he was conscious, that the knowledge of Christ (the gift of the Father to *Peter*) was common to all the Apostles; and therefore he feared the conclusion, *viz.* That the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven (the gift given by Christ to *Peter*) would be common to all the Apostles also.

And thus much of *Stapletons* reasons, proving Peter to be the Rock. *Bellarmin* reasons thus, The pronoun *hanc*, *this*, is referred to the words immediatly going before, *Thou art Peter*; and therefore our Savior by this Rock means Peter.

But it is answered, There is no necessity of referring the pronoun *hanc*, or *this*, to the words immediatly going before, as appears by several places of Scripture, as *Acts* 3. 15. *And killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead, of whom we are witnesses*; where those words *of whom*, are referred to the *Prince of life*, and not unto God who is neareſt. That the pronoun *hunc* or *him*, or *this*, is of necessity referred to the words fatrher off and not to the neareſt, appears also by *Act.* 2. 22. and 23. and 2. *Thess.* 2. most clearly v. 8. *And then shall that wicked one be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume, whose comming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs, and lying wonders*: observe, *whose coming* is referred not to *the Lord*, which is neareſt, but to that *wicked one* further off. And thus we have disputed all the reasons of any moment pretended by either party in this question, if Peter was the Rock?

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Tu es Petrus, *Disputed by General Councils.*

NOw let us Dispute, *Tu es Petrus* by antiquity, examining what was the meaning of the Ancients concerning these words, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.* They brag much of antiquity, *viz.* that the Council of *Chalcedon* and all the Fathers interpret the Rock to be *Peter.*

But it is answered, They resemble Bankrupts, who brag they are richest when they are poorest. A passage (related by *Cicero lib. 2. de oratore*) between *Silus* and *Crassus*, may be applyed to our adversaries, *Fieri potest, ut quod dixit iratus dixerit. Silus annuit tum Crassus, fieri potest ut quod dixit non intelligeres: hic quoque Silus fassus est, tum Crassus fieri potest, ut non omnino audieris quod te audisse dicis: Silus tacuit, omnes riserunt.* This passage is most fitly applyed to our adversaries, bragging of the testimonies of the Ancients, Councils and Fathers; for they bring not one testimony but either it merits no credit, or else it is wrested and misinterpreted, or else it is forged, as appears through the whole following Disput. What was the opinion of the Council of *Chalcedon*, & the other first six general councils? We will examine in this chapter: the opinion of the Fathers shal be examined in the following chapters, unto chap. 10.

From the Council of *Chalcedon* they object the third action, where *Peter* is called, *Petra & crepido Ecclesiæ, the Rock upon which the Church is built.*

But it is answered, first, Those are not the words of the council, but only the words of *Paschasinus, Lucentius*, and *Bonifacius*, Legats to *Leo* Bishop of *Rome*, giving their votes against *Dioscorus* of *Alexandria*: what regard should be had

to

to such testimonies? *Æneas Silvius* (afterward Pope himself, under the name of *Pius* second) will inform you, comment 1. on the Council of *Basil*: His words are, *Nec considerant miseri, quia quæ prædicant tantopere verba, aut ipsorum summorum Pontificum sunt, suas fimbrias extendentium, aut illorum qui eis adulabantur*; *Neither do these miserable men consider, that these testimonies of which they brag so much, are either of Bishops of Rome themselves, enlarging their own interests, or else of those who are flattering them.*

Secondly, it is very strange impudence to them, to alledge the authority of the Council of *Chalcedon*, to prove the Supremacy of *Peter*, or of the Bishop of *Rome*, by reason of his succession to *Peter*, as appears by what follows.

Aetius Legate of the Bishop of *Constantinople* and the foresaids *Paschasinus*, *Lucentius*, and *Bonifacius*, Deputies of the Bishop of *Rome*, pleaded in the behalf of their Masters the Bishops of *Rome* and *Constantinople*, for the primacy: *Paschasinus* and his fellows pleaded the sixth canon of the Council of *Nice*. The words are those, *Let the old custom remain in Egypt, Libya, Pentapolis*, viz. *that the Bishop of Alexandria hath power in those Provinces* (*to ordain Bishops*) *since the Bishops of Rome hath the like custome.*

Aetius pleaded the same Canon, and likewise the fifth Canon of the said Council of *Nice*; by which it was ordained, *That when a Bishop was condemned by a provincial Council, there should be no further appeal, unless to a General Council:* which exception, though not mentioned in the Canon, must of necessity be understood. The said *Aetius* likewise pleaded the third Canon of the second General Council of *Constantinople*; by which it was provided, *That the Bishop of Rome should have the first place in dignity, because Rome was the old Imperial City; the Bishop of Constantinople the second place next to him, because Constantinople was new Rome.* The force of this argument consists

in

in two things. Firſt, that the ſaid ſecond General Council of *Conſtantinople* ordained the Juriſdiction of the Biſhops of *Rome*, and *Conſtantinople* to be equal, although they gave the Biſhop of *Rome* the firſt place in dignity. The ſecond thing is, That the Biſhop of *Rome* had the firſt place in dignity, not by reaſon of his ſucceſſion to *Peter*, but for a civil reſpect; *viz.* becauſe *Rome* was the old Imperial City.

Paſchaſinus and his fellows replyed, (or at leaſt *Bellarmin*, and *Baronius* would have ſo replyed, if they had been pleaders before the Council) That the third Canon of the Council of *Conſtantinople* was not to be regarded; becauſe the Biſhop of *Rome* had never approved it; and therefore they urged the ſixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, by which (ſay they) the Biſhop of *Alexandria* had authority confirmed to him in *Egypt*, becauſe the Biſhop of *Rome* had the like cuſtom. From which they argued thus, That the authority of the Biſhop of *Rome* was the cauſe of the authority of the Biſhop of *Alexandria*; or, the authority of the Biſhop of *Alexandria* flowed from the authority of the Biſhop of *Rome*: And ſince the Biſhop of *Alexandria* was before him of *Conſtantinople*, of old, the ſaid ſecond General Council of *Conſtantinople* wronged the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, in preferring the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* to him. In a word, the ſum of their pleading was this, That, by the ſixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, the Biſhop of *Rome* had authority over him of *Alexandria*, And ſince the Biſhop of *Alexandria* was before the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* in former times, that third Act of the ſecond General Council of *Conſtantinople* ought to be caſſed, and antiquitated; becauſe it contradicted the ſixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, in preferring the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* to him of *Alexandria*, and equalizing him to the Biſhop of *Rome*.

Aetius, and the Deputies of the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* duplyed; Firſt, That the ſaid Canon of the ſecond General

Council of *Constantinople* ought not to be recalled (or at least Protestants would have so duplyed, if they had been in their place;) First, Because it was a lawful General Council; And although the Bishop of *Rome* had not confirmed it, because he had no authority above a General Council; It was very unreasonable that any particular Bishop should cut and carve for his own advantage, against the decree of the whole Church.

Secondly, The said General Council of *Constantinople* was received and confirmed by a Synod at *Rome* two years after, the Bishop of *Rome Dammasus* presiding in the said Council. And therefore it was false that the Bishop of *Rome* never confirmed the said Council of *Constantinople.*

Thirdly, the sixth Canon of the Council of *Nice* gave no authority to the Bishop of *Rome* over the Bishop of *Alexandria*; the meaning of the Canon being only this, *viz.* The occasion of the Canon was one *Miletius* troubled all *Egypt* by ordaining Bishops at his own hand. *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria* complains to the Council of *Nice*, which upon his complaint, made the foresaid sixth Canon. The true Gloss of which being, that the Bishop of *Alexandria*, should have the power of ordaining Bishops in *Egypt*, *Lybia*, and *Pentapolis*, as he was wont; Since the Bishop of *Rome* had the like power by custom, in the places adjacent to *Rome*; or, (as *Ruffinus* a writer, who lived near these times, interprets) *in Ecclesijs Suburbicarijs*, that is, in Churches within a hundred miles to the walls of *Rome*. So then, the authority of the Bishop of *Rome* was not the cause of the authority of the Bishop of *Alexandria*, or the Original from whence it flowed; but only a pattern, according to which it was framed: as one common-wealth may be framed in government according to the pattern of another common-wealth, without any subordination in authority.

They duplyed fourthly, That the said General Council of *Constantinople* did no wrong to the Bishop of *Alexandria*, in giving

giving to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* the ſecond place in dignity: which before that time, belonged to the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, ſince the cauſe ceaſing, the effect alſo ceaſed. The cauſe why the Biſhop of *Alexandria* was ſecond to the Biſhop of *Rome*, was this, viz. The government of *Egypt* was the ſecond government in dignity, to the government of the City of *Rome*: It was ſo ordained by *Auguſtus*, and therefore, was called *Præfectura Auguſtalis*. Since it was not ſo now, becauſe the government of thoſe Provinces depending on the City of *Conſtantinople*, was made the ſecond Government and preferred to that of *Alexandria*, and made equal to the Government of thoſe places, depending upon the city of *Rome*; therefore the ſaid council of *Conſtantinople* did no wrong in equalizing the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* to the Biſhop *Rome*: ſince the civil Government was a Type of the Eccleſiaſtick, as is confeſſed by *Baronius* himſelf, *ad Annum 39. Num. 10.* That the Government, and Priviledges of the City of *Conſtantinople*, being made equal to thoſe of *Rome*, was the cauſe why the council of *Conſtantinople* made the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* equal in Eccleſiaſtick Juriſdiction to the Biſhop of *Rome*: is reported both by *Socrates*, *hiſt. lib. 5. chap. 8.* and *Sozomenus lib. 7. chap. 9.* Who both give the reaſon of the ſaid third Canon (in the Greek Edition, but 5. or 7. in the Latine) to be, *becauſe that Conſtantinople, had not only the name of* Rome, *with like Senat and other Magiſtrats, but bare alſo the ſame Arms and other rights, and honors which belonged to old* Rome.

The Council of *Chalcedon* having conſidered the reaſons of both parties, allowed the interpretation put upon the ſixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, by the Orators of the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*; rejected that Gloſs of thoſe of the Biſhop of *Rome*; confirmed the third Canon of the ſecond General Council of *Conſtantinople*, with ſome advantage, and

addition, as by the 28 Canon, whose words are these; *Definimus & communi calculo sancimus, quod attinet ad prærogativas honoris sanctissimæ Ecclesiæ hujus Constantinopoleos novæ Romæ, Etenim Patres, Sedi Antiquioris Romæ, ob eam caussam quia Imperium obtinevet Urbs illa, merito Primatum honoris detulere. Sed & eadem ratione moti, centum quinquaginta religiosissimi Episcopi æqualem primatum honoris assignarunt sanctissimæ sedi novæ Romæ. Recte judicantes, eam Urbem quæ imperio & Senatu honestatur: & iisdem priviligis fruentem cum antiqua Roma & Regia; etiam in Ecclesiasticis negotijs æqua cum illa extollendam, Sic tamen ut post eam secundum locum obtineat.* By which Canon two things appears, First, that the Bishop of *Constantinople* is expresly made equal in Ecclesiastick Jurisdiction, with the Bishop of *Rome*. Secondly, that the Bishop of *Rome* hath the first place in dignity, not by reason of succession to *Peter*; but only for civil respects; viz. because *Rome* was the old imperial City. It appears also by the said Canon, that the former General Councils of *Nice* and *Constantinople*, gave the primacy to the Bishop of *Rome*, for the same reason only; *viz.* because it was the old imperial City. And therefore it is intollerable impudence in our adversaries to object the authority of the Council of *Chalcedon*, to prove the Supremacy of *Peter*.

By which it appears the impudence of *Bellarmin*, and *Baronius*, who abuse their Reader with strange Sophistry, and most shameless. The Council of *Chalcedon*, say they, interpreted the sixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, to the advantage of the Bishop of *Rome*: For immediatly after the reading of the said Canon, the beginning of which was, *Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum*, *the Church of Rome evermore had the primacy*, The Canon being thus read, all the Council cryed out, *Perpendimus omnem primatum & honorem præcipuum secundum Canones, antiquæ Romæ Deo amantissimo Archiepiscopo conservari.*

But

But it is anſwered; firſt, Thoſe words of the Canon, *viz. the Church of Rome ever had the primacy*, are forged; being found in no other copie, but in that of *Dionyſius Exiguus*: but his authority is not ſufficient to out-balance all other copies of the Canons of the Council, both Greek and Latin; yea, that copie corrected by *Gregory* 13. himſelf, which wants thoſe firſt words pretended by *Bellarmin* and *Baronius*: in which copie and all other copies, the firſt words of the ſaid Canon are, *Antiquus mos perduret, &c. Let the old cuſtom remain in Egypt, Libya*, and *Pentapolis, &c.*

Secondly, although the Canon had begun ſo, it makes not much to the purpoſe, ſince it appears by the decree of the Council, that the Primacy of the Church of *Rome*, was only a Primacy of dignity, for civil reſpects, and not a Primacy of Juriſdiction, by reaſon of the Biſhop of *Romes* ſucceſſion to *Peter*: as appears expreſly by the words of the Canon: And alſo that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* was ordained by the ſaid Council, equal in Juriſdiction to the Biſhop of *Rome*. If *Bellarmin* and *Baronius* affirm, that the words of the twenty-eight Canon are miſ-interpreted, their mouths are ſtopped, not only by the carriage of *Lucentius*, and other two Legats of the Biſhop of *Rome*, but alſo by the carriage of *Leo* Biſhop of *Rome* himſelf.

The carriage of *Lucentius* was this, When the Fathers of the Council had ſubſcribed the ſaid twenty eight Canon, *Lucentius* ſtood up, crying, foul play: *Some of thoſe ſubſcribers were compelled ſo to do, by one indirect way or other*: The whole Fathers of the Council anſwered, they had deliberatly, and voluntarily ſubſcribed. Whereupon *Lucentius* proteſted againſt the Council, as having preferred the judgement of a hundred and fifty Fathers of the Council of *Conſtantinople*, before the judgement of three hundred and eighteen Fathers, in the firſt general Council of *Nice*, which was as much to

ſay

say, as he understood the meaning of the sixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, better then those six hundred and thirty Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon*, representing the whole Church, This carraige of *Lucentius* is recorded in the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Act.* 16. pag. 936. 937. 938.

Next, that the said Council decerned against the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, appears by four Epistles of *Leo* Bishop of *Rome* himself; in which he thunders against the Council of *Chalcedon* for making the foresaid 28. Canon; still ingeminating, *Tu es Petrus*, or that they had wronged the supremacy of *Peter*; by which complaints of his it is most evident, that those 630. Fathers, representing the whole Church in a general Council, meant nothing lesse then the supremacy of *Peter*, in these words, *Tu es Petrus*. These four Epistles of *Leo* are his 52. Epistle to *Anatolius* Bishop of *Constantinople*; His 54. to *Martianus* the Emperour, his 55. to *Pulcheria* the Empress; his 62. to *Maximus* Bishop of *Antioch*; in which Epistles he complains heavily, that the Bishop of *Constantinople* was preferred to him of *Alexandria*. Because *Constantinople* was the seat of the Emperor, he fore-saw (being a man of great Spirit and foresight) that in the end, for the same reason, the Bishop of *Constantinople* would be preferred to the Bishop of *Rome*; which accordingly fell out, as shal be proved, *lib* 4. And thus it appeareth, with how little integrity our adversaries object the Council of *Chalcedon*, to prove that *Peter* was the Rock, meaned by our Savior in these words, *Tu es Petrus*, &c. By which proceedings of the Council of *Chalcedon*, appears also, what was the opinion of the general councils of *Nice* and *Constantinople*.

As for the sixth general Council, commonly called *Trullanum*, celebrated under *Pogonatus* the Emperor; *Anno* 680. in its 36. Canon, it confirms the 28. Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon totidem verbis*; By which it appears what was the opinion

opinion of the Church concerning *Tu es Petrus*, in the end of the 7. age. And so we have the opinion of the first, second, fourth, and sixth general Councils, that *Peter* is not the Rock upon which the Church is built.

As for the third general council of *Ephesus*, and the fifth of *Constantinople*, although in expres words, they make not all the Patriarchs of alike Jurisdiction; Yet they made Canons expresly contradicting the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*; and consequently, contradicting also *Peter* to be the Rock upon which the Church is built. The council of *Ephesus* calls *Celestine* Bishop *Rome* Fellow-Minister. It were a bold thing now in any Bishop to salute the *Pope* so. Secondly, they deposed *John* Patriarch of *Antioch*, before ever they acquainted *Celestine* Bishop of *Rome*, as appears by the Synodical Epistle, *Binius Tom.* 1. *page* 806. Thirdly, they ordained that neither the Patriarch of *Antioch*, nor any other Bishop (*ergo* not the Bishop of *Rome*) should take upon him to ordain Bishops in the Isle of *Cyprus*, *Binius Tom.* 26, *pag.* 768.

As for the fifth general council of *Constantinople*, it rejudged the cause of *Anthimius*, after he had first been judged by *Aggapetus* B shop of *Rome*; *Binius* in his notes upon that council, *Tom* 2. *pag* 416. Secondly, it condemned *Vigilius* Bishop of *Rome*, and yet in the end the said *Vigilius* approved the said council: *Baronius*, Anno 553. *Binius* in the place fore-mentioned. And thus ye have the opinion of the six first general councils, concerning the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, by reason of his succession to *Peter*, in the Monarchy of the Church: By which passages it appears that the sixth first general councils meaned nothing lesse, then that *Peter* was the Rock, upon which the Church was built; or that *Peter* was ordained Monarch of the Church, in those words, *Tu es Petrus*. It shal likewise be proved, *lib.* 5. That the seventh general council, *Anno* 790. and the 8. *Anno* 870.

had

had as little regard to the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*. The first of which condemned Pope *Honorius* as an Heretick and the last approved of it.

And thus we have the opinion of the whole Church, concerning *Tu es Petrus*, the first 900. year after Christ: all which time, it was no article of Faith, (as appears by those eight general Councils) that *Peter* was ordained Monarch of the Church, in those words, *Tu es Petrus*. The truth is, it was invented, First, by *Leo* after the Council of *Chalcedon*, when the contention arose between the Bishops of *Rome* and *Constantinople*, for the Primacy: it was still made use of by the Bishops of *Rome*, after that, pleading for the Primacy; but it appears by the 3. Epistle of *Gregory*, that he made use of it, only for *cura universalis Ecclesiæ*, and not for Jurisdiction: for he expresly thunders against one visible head of of the Church: amongst other reasons, he hath this for one, *Although Peter had the care of the whole Church, committed into him yet was he not universal Apostle.* And thus we have reasoned, *Tu es Petrus*, from Scripture, Reason, and General Councils. Now let us hear the opinion of the Fathers.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Fathers interpreting the Rock to be CHRIST.

THeir impudence in objecting the Fathers, is yet greater: All the Fathers say they, interpret the Rock to be *Petor*, *Augustinus* only excepted, deceived by his ignorance, in the *Syriack* tongue. So objects *Iansenius*, *Gregorious de Valentia*, *Agricola*, *Stapleton*; but most of all *Bozius*, *de signis lib.* 18. *cap.* 1.

But it is answered, It is notoriously false, that all the Fathers call *Peter* the Rock upon which the Church is built: because

becauſe many of the Fathers call Chriſt the Rock, as ſhal be proved in this 4. *chapter*. Others of them intetpret, the Rock to be the confeſsion of *Peter*, *thou art the Son of the living God*, as ſhal be proved, *chap*. 5. Others of them again, who interpret the Rock to be *Peter* means nothing leſs, then that *Peter* was was ordained Oecumenick Biſhop by Chriſt, in thoſe words, *Tu es Petrus*, as ſhal be proved *chap*. 6. And firſt of thoſe Fathers interpreting the Rock to be Chriſt.

Tertullianus againſt *Martian*. *lib*. 4. *cap*. 13. Where, telling a reaſon wherefore the name of *Peter* was changed from *Simon* to *Peter*, gives this reaſon, *Quia Petra & lapis erat Chriſtus, becauſe the Rock was Chriſt.*

Hilarius de Trinitate, lib. 2. *Unum igitur, hoc eſt immobile fundamentum, una hac eſt felix fidei Petra, Petri ore confeſſa, Filius Dei vivi*: The ſum is: *Chriſt confeſſed by the mouth of Peter is the only Rock.*

Ambroſius, Sermon 84. Diſcourſing of the change of *Peters* name, *Rectè igitur, qui à Petra Chriſto Simon nuncupatus eſt Petrus, ut, qui cum Domino fidei ſocietatem habebat, cum Domino haberet & nominis Dominici unitatem: ut ſicut à Chriſto Chriſtianus dicitur. Ita à Petra Chriſto, Petrus Apoſtolus vocaretur.* This teſtimony is very evident, and jumps in every thing with the expoſition of *Proteſtants*; ſhewing that *Peter* is not the Rock, but only Chriſt: & *Peter* is called *Petrus*, *Rocky*, from Chriſt, *Petra*, or the Rock.

Gregorius Nyſſenus in the laſt chapter of his teſtimonies againſt the *Jews*, *Dominus eſt Petra fidei: tanquam fundamentum, ut ipſe Dominus ait ad Principem Apoſtolorum. Tu es Petrus, & ſuper hanc Petram ædificabo Eccleſiam meam* In which words, Chriſt is expreſly called the Rock, upon which the Church is built.

Theodoretus upon *Pſalm* 47. *Petra angularis eſt Chriſtus, & ipſe Dominus beato Petro, inquit, Et ſuper hanc Petram ædificabo*

Ecclesiam meam; & porta inferi non prevalebunt adversus eam. The Rock is Christ upon which the Church is built; &c. And the same Author, on 1. *Cor. cap.* 3. *Christus est fundamentum, Christ is the Rock.*

Gregory Bishop of *Rome* himself, in *Job, lib.* 13. *cap.* 19. *in Sacro eloquio, Cum singulari numero Petra nominatur, quis alius quam Christus accipitur? Paulo attestante, qui ait, Petra erat Christus.* This testimony is evident, of a Bishop of *Rome* himself, cannonized as a Saint in the Roman Church; giving a general rule of interpreting the word *Rock*; *viz.* When *Petra*, or *Rock* or *foundation*, is mentioned in Scripture, in the singular number, none but Christ is understood.

Hieronymus on *Matthew* 7. *Super hanc Petram Dominus fundavit Ecclesiam: ab hac Petra Apostolus Petrus sortitus est nomen.* By which words it appears, that Christ is the Rock, from whom *Peter* had his name; and not *Peter* himself, which will be further cleared by the next testimony.

Augustinus, Sermo. 13. de verbis Domini secundum *Matheum. Simon quippe ante vocabatur, hoc autem nomen ei, ut Petrus vocetur à Domino, impositum est & hoc, ut ea figura significaret Ecclesiam: quia enim Christus Petra, Petrus populus Christianus. Petra enim principale nomen est: ideo Petrus à Petra, non Petra à Petro; quomodo non à Christiano Christus, sed à Christo Christianus vocatur. Who before was called Simon, was after called Peter: Our Savior calls him so, to signifie the Church by that figure: Because Christ is the Rock, Peter is the Christian People*, &c. Other testimonies might be alledged out of *Augustinus*, but it is needless to mention them, since it is confessed by our adversaries, that *Augustinus* interprets the Rock to be Christ, because he was ignorant of the Syriack tongue; As if those other Fathers, especially *Hieronymus*, most skilful of the Oriental Languages, were ignorant also of the Syriack tongue. And thus much of those Fathers interpreting the Rock to be Christ, by which it

appears,

appears, how impudent an assertion it was of *Bozius*, *Iansenius*, *De Valentia*, *Agricola*, *Stapleton*, and others, affirming all the Fathers (*Augustinus* only excepted) unanimously interpiets the *Rock* to be *Peter*.

The falshood of their assertion being discovered, they fall next to Sophistry to defend their lying: And first, they fall upon *Augustinus*, taxing him of ignorance of the Syriack tongue, for interpreting the *Rock* to be Christ, But it is answered, First, the testimonies of those other Fathers denying *Peter* to be the Rock, especially of *Hieronymus*, are no lesse evident, then the testimonies of *Augustinus*,: But it were impudence in them, to object ignorance of the Syriack tongue to *Hieronymus*, who was known to be most skilful in it. Secondly, their Sophistry is very great, they object ignorance to *Augustinus*, of the Syrian tongue, for denying the *Rock* to be *Peter*, following the penner of *Matthew* in Greek; whose version was followed by the whole Church as authentick: & defends the ignorance of suppositititious Authors, such as *Anacletus*, *Optatus*, *Melevitanus*, *Isidorus* & such like, who interpret *Cephas* (which signifyeth a great stone in the Syrian tongue (a *head* to prove the supremacy of *Peter* because of the affinity it hath in its initial Letters, with the Greek word κεφαλη Cephale or head. So *Turrianus* and *Baronius*, Anno 31. defends those ignorants, *viz*. Because it makes for the Popes supremacy, and blames *Augustinus*, as ignorant, for no other reason, then because his interpretation crosseth it.

As for those other Fathers beside *Augustinus*, some of them taxeth them also of ignorance so *Stapleton*, *Salmero*, *Cumerus*, *Maldonatus*; Let us hear their reasons.

Their first is, These words, *super hanc Petram*, answers to the former words, *Tu es Petrus*: But it is answered those words, *Super hanc Petram*, answer also to those words, *Thou art Christ the Son of the living God*: For there is no necessity of re-

ferring the pronoun *hanc*, to the words immediatly going before which is proved by other passages of scripture; as *Acts* 2.23 where the proun *hunc* is referred not to God which is neareſt, but to *Iesus of Nazareth* farther off. And also in this Chapter, by testimonies of Fathers of more authority, and lesse suspect in this particular, then *Stapleton* and *Maldonat*: and it shall be proved further in the following chapters not only by testimonies of most eminent Fathers, and Popish Doctors, but also by the testimonies of five *Popes* themselves.

Their second reason is, Christ in these words, gives some reward or other to *Peter* for his confession: but it is answered, *Peter* is rewarded, when he is called *Petrus* from *Petra*, or Christ the Rock. Second'y, when he gets the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, whence *Chrysostom*, *As the Father gave unto thee to know me, so I give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.*

The third reason is, That Christ in these words, *super hanc Petram*, means not the principal *Rock*, or proper, *viz.* himself; but only a Metaphorick, or Ministerial *Rock*, and consequently the *Rock* must be *Peter*.

But it is answered the estate of the question is, whether Christ, that is the principal *Rock*, be understood by *super hanc Petrum? Stapleton* proves not, because, saith he, Christ is not meaned which he proves by his own naked assertion, without any other reason: which is a childish *petitio principij*. However we will add a reason that his assertion is false; for if a Ministerial *Rock* be understood, in these words, *super hanc Petrum*; *Stapleton* is hard put to it, to prove out of these words, the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, which is his main intention: Since it shal appear, *cap 6.* that all the Apostles are *Ministerial Rocks*; and that by the testimonies of the Fathers, interpreting the Rock to be *Peter*.

Their fourth reason is, The words of our Savior are,

ædificabo

ædificabo Eccleſiam meam ſuper hanc Petram, Which imports as much, as the Church was not already built upon that Rock; but only to be built upon it afterwards: and therefore our Savior by *Hanc Petram*, cannot mean himſelf upon whom the Church was already built. But it is anſwered, This is nothing but ſophiſtry, becauſe already the Church was only built upon Chriſt in *Judea*; But our Saviour is propheſying here, that the Gopel ſhal be propagated throughout the whole world, and the Church built upon himſelf. It is childiſh reaſoning to argue the Church is built upon Chriſt already, *Ergo* it cannot be ſaid, it ſhall be built upon him in time to come; it is all one as one would reaſon thus, *Matthew* 1. it is affirmed, *He ſhal ſave his people. Ergo he hath not ſaved them*; and conſequently, it is no leſs fooliſh to affirm the Church is already built upon Chriſt, becauſe he promiſeth to build it upon himſelf in time to come.

Their fifth reaſon is, Chriſt promiſeth to build the Church upon one or other beſides himſelf; ſince he cannot be ſaid to build the Church upon himſelf: for it is the Father *qui dedit ipſum caput ſuper omnem Eccleſiam*, as the Apoſtle affirms, But it is anſwered, That aſſertion of *Stapletons* contradicts *Auguſtinus*, affirming, *ſuper me ipſum filium Dei vivi ædificabo Eccleſiam*. Which is his gloſs upon theſe words, *ſuper hanc Petram*. Secondly, It contradicts *Bellarmin*, affirming, *in ſe jam ædificaverat Apoſtolos, & Diſcipulos multos*, *He had already built upon himſelf many Apoſtles and Diſciples*. Thirdly, It contradicts Scripture, *Epheſians* 4. 16. *By whom all the body being coupled and knit together, &c. receiveth increaſe of the body, unto the edifying of it ſelf in love*. By which words compared with verſe 15. follows that the Church is built upon Chriſt by himſelf.

Their ſixth reaſon is, If by *hanc Petram* be meant Chriſt, we cannot know which is the true Church, and which is the falſe?

false? and therefore of necessity by *hanc Petram*, Peter must be meaned.

But it is answered, The Fathers we now mentioned, and shal mention in the following chapter, knew very well how to discern the true Church by the false; & yet none of them do interpret Peter to be the Rock, upon which the Church is built, especially, *Augustinus*, who disputing against the *Donatists*, cites many passages of Scripture, by which we are instructed, to discern the true Church by the false, and yet he never makes use of this place, *Tues Petrus*. Which he would not have omitted, if the mentioning of it had been so necessar, to discern the true Church from the false: or if the true Church could not be discerned from the false without it. Secondly, This reason is a childish, if not blasphemous, *petitio principij*: As if none could show the true Church by the false, except the successor of Peter, upon whom in their opinion the Church is built: and so that is only the true Church, which acknowledgeth the Bishop of *Rome*, to be head of the Church; as successor to Peter in the Monarchy of the Church. And thus much of those Fathers interpreting the Rock to be Christ.

CHAP. V.

Of the Fathers expounding the Rock, to be the Confession of Peter.

NOw followeth those Fathers expounding the Rock to be the Faith, or confession of Peter; which opinion though it seems to differ in words from the former, yet in effect it is all one in substance with it. And therefore some of those Fathers, who called the Rock Christ, they cal also the Rock the confession of Peter: So *Nyssenus*, &c. the Fathers interpreting the

the Rock to be the confeſſion of *Peter*, are theſe following.

The Liturgy commonly called that of S. *James*, *ad confirmationem ſanctæ tuæ Catholicæ & Apoſtolicæ Eccleſiæ, quam fundâſti ſuper Petra fidei, ut Portæ inferni non prevaleant ei.* The ſum of which words is, that the Church is founded upon the Rock of Faith.

Entychianus Biſhop of *Rome*, Epiſt. 1. *Unum hoc & immobile fundamentum, una hæc felix fidei Petra Petri ore confeſſa, Tu es, inquit Chriſtus filius Dei vivi*, that is, *This is the only happy Rock of Faith*, confeſſed by *Peter Hilarius* in his Books of the Trinity, in many places affirms that the Church is built upon the Rock of confeſſion; or that the Rock is the confeſſion of *Peter*. It is needleſs to mention all his teſtimonies, this one will ſuffice, *Super hanc igitur confeſſionis Petram Eccleſiæ ædificatio eſt, The Church is built upon this Rock of confeſſion.*

Nyſſenus in the laſt chapter of his teſtimonies againſt the *Jews*, after he had firſt called the *Rock* Chriſt, as we ſaid before, in the following words he adds, *Tu es Petrus & ſuper hanc Petram ædificabo Eccleſiam meam, hoc eſt, ſuper confeſſionem Chriſti*: where he interprets the *Rock* to be alſo the confeſſion of *Peter*, by which it appears, that the ſenſe is all one, whether the *Rock* be called Chriſt or the confeſſion of *Peter*?

Innumerable others interpret the Rock to be the Confeſſion of *Peter*, whoſe teſtimonies are needleſs to be mentioned, ſince none can deny them: As *Chryſoſtom*, *homil.* 55. upon *Matthew*, and in other places. *Baſilius Seleucienſis* on *Matthew* 16. *Theophylactus* on the ſame place. *Epiphanius Contra Catharos*, *Iſidorus Peluſiota*, *lib.* 1. *Epiſt.* 235. *Cyrillus*, *lib.* 4. of his *Dialogues*, with *Hermias Theodoretus*, *lib.* 2 upon the *Canticles*. *Auguſtinus*, *tract.* 10. upon the firſt *Epiſtle* of *John*. Whereby again it appears that the meaning of thoſe Fathers

Fathers, interpreting the *Rock* to be Christ, and the confession of *Peter*, mean the same thing: Since *Augustinus* most frequently interprets the *Rock* to be Christ. It is needless to mention other Fathers, calling the confession of *Peter* the *Rock*, as *Felix* third Bishop of *Rome*, in his Epistle to *Zeno* the Emperor concerning the deposition of *Peter* Bishop of *Antioch*; of the sixth General Council of *Constantinople*, called *Trullanum*: of *Damascenus* in his Sermon upon the transfiguration of Christ; of *Victor Antiochenus*, upon *Mark* third, and diverse others: which testimonies are acknowledged by our adversaries to which they vary in their answers.

Pighius Hierarchiæ, lib. 3. cap. 5. calls those Fathers ignorants; who interpret the Rock to be the confession of *Peter*, and that they are not worthy to be answered: *Baronius* is also *totus in fermento*, and calls them mad men, *Anno 31. chap. 7.*

Bellarmin and Stapleton answers more modestly, to the testimony of those Fathers, distinguishing the *Faith or Confession of Peter*; which they say may be considered two wayes. First, Absolutely, and *in abstracto*, that is, not considered as in any subject. Secondly, as it is in the person of *Peter*, or, in *concreto*. In the first acception, they deny that those Fathers call the Faith or Confession of *Peter* to be the Rock: in the second they affirm they do, and that their meaning is no other then that *Petrus credens*, or *Peter* believing, is the Rock. Which opinion they affirm to be all one with their own, *viz.* that *Peter* is the Rock.

But it is replyed, This gloss or distinction is far beside the meaning of those Fathers, who interpret the *Faith or Confession of Peter to be the Rock*, as a thing differing from *Peter* himself. So *Chrysostom* in his *Homile* on *Matthew* 55. 5. *Super hanc Petram dixit, & non super hunc Petrum. Non enim super hominem, sed super fidem, ædificabit Ecclesiam.* Which words he hath also in his Sermon upon Penticost, in which he

he quite overthrows the distinction of *Stapleton* and *Bellarmin*, averring only the confession of *Peter*, and not at all *Peter* himself to be the Rock.

Augustin in his 13. Sermon, *de verb. Dom secundum Mat.* hath these words, *I will not build my Church upon thee, but thee upon me*; whereby he expresly denys *Peter* to be the Rock at all; likewise *Cyrillus de Trinitate lib.* 4. *Gregory, Nyssen*, in his testimonies against the Jews, *Hilarius lib.* 2. of the Trinity, expresly distinguish the Rock from *Peter*, and therefore they cannot mean that *Peter* is the Rock.

It may be also proved by reason, that in the opinion of those Fathers, *Peter* cannot be the Rock at all: that is, *Petrus credens*, or *Peter believing*. We will only mention three reasons; First, The Rock upon which the Church is built is perpetual, because a perpetual building requires a perpetual foundation; but *Peter* is no perpetual foundation, since he dyed, and was removed a little after that promise.

Secondly, The thing which *Peter* confessed, whether it be taken formally for the Act of Confession, or objectively, for the thing confessed; cannot be *Peter* himself, since both those propositions are false. *The Confession of* Peter, *is* Peter; *and the thing confessed by* Peter, *is* Peter: but those Fathers in the former chapter affirm, that the Rock was the thing confessed by *Peter* and the Fathers of this chapter: that it was the confession of *Peter*: (the meaning of both Fathers is the same, as we proved in *Nyssenus*, and *Augustinus*) Ergo neither of those Fathers, whether they interpret the Rock to be the thing confessed by *Peter*, or the confession of *Peter*, can mean that *Peter* is the Rock himself.

Thirdly, Suppose that some believed in Christ, in the dayes of our Savior, who never heard so much as the name of *S. Peter*. It cannot be denyed but those persons were built upon the Rock: But it cannot be affirmed that they were built

upon *Peter*, since they never so much as heard of his name. *Bellarmin*, *Polus*, and *Sanderus*, endeavor to prove by several *Sophistries*, that the Faith, or Confession of *Peter* cannot be the Rock upon which the Church is built; because (say they) the house and the Foundation most be *Homogeneous*: the Church is composed of *Men*, but the Confession, and Faith of *Peter* is a quality, but a quality cannot be the foundation of a house consisting of Men: or substances.

But it is answered, First, The *Faith and confession* of *Peter* may be considered two wayes. First, *Formally* for the quality of Faith, or act of Confession. Secondly, *Objectively*, for the thing confessed, *viz.* Christ, when those Fathers call the *Faith, or Confession of Peter the Rock*, they take it *Objectively* for the thing confessed, or believed; for, as we said before, those Fathers who call Christ the Rock, and those who call the *confession* of *Peter the Rock*, mean all one thing; Since those who in one place call Christ the Rock, in another call *the confession of Peter the Rock*: So *Nyssenus* and *Augustinus*, as we shewed before.

Secondly, We retort the Argument, reasoning *ex concessis*. First, they confess that the Foundation of the Church, must be *Homogeneous* to the Church it self. So *Pighius* and *Bellarmin*. Secondly, they grant that no Faith is *Homogeneous* to the Church So *Pighius* expresly affirms that Faith and the Church, *differunt toto genere*: from those premisses, no *Logician* will deny this conclusion to follow in *Camestres*: *Ergo*, no Faith can be the foundation of the Church. Which conclusion expresly contradicts the third Session of the Council of *Trent*, asserting *the Symbole of Faith to be the only and sure foundation, upon which the Church is built, and against which the gates of hell shal not prevail:* And this is all of any moment what they object against those Fathers, affirming the Rock to be the confession of *Peter*.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of Fathers interpreting Peter *to be the* Rock.

WHen *Bozius*, and others of the Doctors of the Church of *Rome*, objected that all the Fathers, *Greek* and *Latin*, interpreted the Rock to be *Peter*, *Auguſtinus* only excepted; It was anſwered, Firſt, That it was notoriouſly falſe, that all the Fathers interpreted the Rock to be *Peter*: the truth of which anſwer we have ſufficiently proved in the former chapters, *viz.* many of the Fathers interpreted the *Rock to be Chriſt*, *chap.* 4. Others of them interpreted the *Rock to be the Faith and Confeſſion of Peter*, *chap.* 5. Neither did thoſe Fathers, *chap.* 4. and *chap.* 5. contradict one another, we ſhewed before that their meaning was one; who called the *Rock Chriſt*, and the Rock, *the confeſſion of Peter.*

It was anſwered, Secondly, That the meaning of thoſe Fathers, calling the *Rock Peter*, was nothing leſs, then that *Peter* in thoſe words of *Chriſt*, *thou art Peter and upon this Rock I will build my Church*, was by our Savior ordained Oecumenick Biſhop: It is needleſs to ſet down all the teſtimonies of thoſe Fathers mentioned by *Bellarmin*; ſince we grant that they call the *Rock* Peter. So *Clemens*, *Tertullianus*, *Cypri-anus*, *Athanaſius*, *Origines*, *Hilarius*, *Ambroſius*, *Hieronymus*, *Nazianzenus*, *Chryſoſtomus*, *Pſellus*, *Auguſtinus*, *Maximus Taurinenſis*, *Cyrillus Alexandrinus*, *Leo Magnus*, *Proſper*, *Andreas Cretenſis*, *Gregorius Magnus*, *Theophylactus*. Whoſe teſtimonies you may find in *Bellarmin*, who objects them; we will only demonſtrat in this following chapter, that thoſe Teſtimonies are of no moment, neither is it their meaning or ſcope to prove that Peter was ordained *Oecumenick Biſhop*; although they expreſly affirm that Peter

is the Rock, *upon which Christ built his Church.* It is a notable and subtile Disput, and of great importance, since upon it depends what opinion Antiquity had of the supremacy of *Peter*, and consequently of the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, and necessar communion with the Church of *Rome*. The reasons, wherefore those Fathers (although they call the Rock *Peter*) do not affirm he was ordained Oecumenick Bishop, are those following. The first is,

Those Fathers could have no other opinion of the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, or of *Peter*, then that of the whole Church: But the whole Church in their times was against the supremacy of *Peter*, or the Bishop of *Rome*; For it shal be proved *lib.* 3. that the first, second, and third General Councils were against the supremacy of both: and likewise the fourth and fifth General Councils, *lib.* fourth and the sixth, seventh, and eight General Councils *lib.* 5. which was hinted at above, *chap.* 3.

Secondly, Many of *Bellarmins* testimonies are forged, as shal be proved, *lib.* 2. and 3. As the Epistle of *Clement* to *James*, of *Athanasius* to *Felix* Bishop of *Rome*, as is acknowledged by *Baronius*, *anno* 357. paragraph 66. and *Binius* upon that Epistle *tom.* 1. *part.* 1. *Concil*, of *Augustinus* in his Sermons upon the Saints, of which we need no other proof of Forgery, then that our adversaries themselves tax *Augustinus* of ignorance of the *Syriack* tongue, for interpreting the Rock to be Christ: unanimously confessing he denyeth the Rock to be *Peter*. It is needless to set down the reasons by which learned Men, both *Protestants* and *Papists* prove those *Sermons de sanctis* attributed to *Augustinus* to be supposititious.

Thirdly, Many of those Fathers who interpret the Rock to be *Peter*, interpret it also to be Christ, *or the Confession*

of

of Peter, as *Tertullianus*, *Hilarius*, *Ambrosius*, *Hieronymus*, *Chrysostomus*, *Origines*, *Augustinus*. Neither do they contradict themselves, their meaning is all one, and it shal be immediatly shewed nothing less then the Supremacy of *Peter*.

Fourthly, The reasons wherefore those Fathers interpret the Rock to be *Peter*, inferr no wayes that he was Oecumenick Bishop; but on the contrair, demonstrat that he was not Oecumenick Bishop: Since in their opinion others may be called Rocks, as well as *Peter*, *viz*. *Nazianzeus* in his Oration, for moderation affirms, *Petrus Petra vocatur, quia Ecclesiæ fundamenta suæ fidei credita habet.* That is, *Peter was called the Rock, because he had the foundations of the Church concredited to his Faith*, *Ambrosius*; *Sermon* 47. *Because he layed first the foundations of Faith amongst the nations, therefore Peter was called the Rock.* *Theophylactus* affirms, *he was called the Rock, because of his Faith and Confession that Christ was the Son of God.* *Epiphanius*, *Because he founded the Faith of our Lord, upon which the Church is built, he was made a solid Rock unto us.* *Hæres in Catharis.* *Theophanes Ceraneus*, As he is cited by *Salmero*, *tom.* 4. *part.* 3. *tract.* 2. affirms, *That Peter was called the Rock, because of his Confession*: by which it appears that the reasons, wherefore *Peter* was called the Rock, are two: First, because he founded Churches. Secondly, because he confessed Christ: Neither of which inferr an Oecumenick Bishop: since no Sophister never so impudent can deny. that others as well as *Peter*, founded Churches and confessed Christ: neither is it of any moment what they object, that *Peter* was the first that founded the Church and confessed Christ: as *Theophylactus* seems to import; since it shal be proved afterward, that the Apostles before this confession of *Peter*, confessed *Christ to be Son of God*, *Matthew* 14. and *John* 6. *or the great Prophet*; see also

Luke

Luke 1. 42. and 43. and 2. 30. 31. 32. Secondly, Albeit *Peter* had first confessed Christ, and by that confession first founded the Church; it argues no supremacy in *Peter*, or Jurisdiction over the Church, no more then it followeth that *Aristotle* hath Jurisdiction over Logicians, because he taught Logick first.

Fifthly, and mainly, because those Fathers who interpret *Peter* to be the Rock, call others beside *Peter* in the same sense, *Rocks*; whence it is evinced unanswerably, they intend nothing less then the supremacy of *Peter*; by that gloss. It were tedious to go through them all, we will only instance some testimonies of those Fathers, of whom our adversaries do most brag, by which will appear the meaning of the rest. The first is of *Origines*, *tractat.* 1. upon *Matthew*, *Quod si super unum illum* Petrum *tantum existimas ædificari totam Ecclesiam, quid dicturus de Joanne filio tonitrui, & Apostolorum unoquoque? quin aliqui num audebimus dicere, quod adversus* Petrum *unam non prævalituræ sint portæ inferorum, adversus autem cæteros Apostolos, ac præfectos prævalituræ sint? ac non potius in omnibus & singulis eorum de quibus dictum est, fit illud quod dictum est, & portæ inferorum non prævalebunt adversus eam; item illud, super hanc* Petram *ædificabo Ecclesiam meam.* No Father is more pressed by *Bellarmin*, then *Origen*, to prove that Peter was the Rock: and here ye have not only the testimony of *Origen*, that the other Apostles were Rocks as well as *Peter*, but also his probation of it. First, he propones and states the question, Do ye think (sayeth he) that those words of Christ, *upon this Rock I will build my Church*, are spoken only to *Peter*? you are deceived, what shal we then say of *John* the son of thunder? So then the proposition he undertakes to prove, is, that our Savior promised to build his Church upon all the Apostles, as Rocks: which he proves by this reason, because it was said to

all

all, the gates of hell ſhal not prevail againſt it: and a little after the words now cited, he adds another reaſon, *viz.* becauſe the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to all the Apoſtles as well as to *Peter*.

Bellarmin anſwers, *Origen* in this place ſpeaks allegorically, otherwiſe he would contradict himſelf in his 5. *homily* upon *Exodus*, where he calls *Peter* a great Foundation, and moſt ſolid *Rock*, upon whom the Church is built.

But it is replyed, there is no contradiction at all; for *Peter* may be *Magnum fundamentum & ſolidiſsima Petra*, and yet not only the Foundation or Rock: for the ſtate of the queſtion is not, Whether *Peter* was the foundation and Rock, upon whom the Church was built? But whether he be the only Foundation and Rock upon which the Church is built?

Bellarmin inſtances, ſecondly, That this teſtimony of *Origen* conſiſts not with the words of Chriſt, Becauſe they are only ſpoken of *Peter*, and underſtood of him; *Ergo*, this teſtimony of *Origen* muſt needs be allegorical. But it is anſwered, Allthough the words of Chriſt were directed to *Peter*, yet *Origen* not only affirms, but proves by two unanſwerable reaſons, that the promiſe was made to all, as well as *Peter*: *Moſes* ſpeaking of *Abraham*, affirms he believed in *God*, and it was imputed to him for righteouſneſs: and yet the Apoſtle *Paul* applyes that to all the faithful, which is no *Allegory*, but *Tropology*, by which a general promiſe belonging to all, is directed to one. *Bellarmin* ſhould take heed to reaſon thus; *The words were directed to Peter alone:* Ergo, *the promiſe was made to him alone:* For if this promiſe was made alone to *Peter*, the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome* is quite deſtroyed; ſince it was not made to the Biſhops of *Rome*, ſucceſſors of *Peter*, being only made to *Peter*, to whom the words were directed.

Bellarmins third reaſon to prove the teſtimony of *Origines*

to

to be allegorical, is this: If all the Apostles be foundations, or all the faithful, the whole Church would be foundation of it self, since there are no other besides to be the walls and the roof. But it is answered; First, that the Church is built upon all the faithful, because it consists of them; and so *Lyranus* on *Matthew* 16. affirms, *That the Church doth not consist in men of power, and dignity, either Secular, or Ecclesiastick: because many Bishops of* Rome *have been Apostats* from the faith; *And therefore the Church consists only of the faithful.* Secondly, the Apostles are called foundations in a peculiar manner; because they founded the Church by preaching that Doctrine received from Christ, and sealed it with their blood.

Bellarmin objects lastly *ad hominem*, that Protestants affirm that *Peter* cannot be the Rock, because he is a meer man: but saith he, that reason militats against any other mans being the Rock. But it is answered, That Protestants deny any man to be the Rock unless Christ, sustaining alone the whole burthen of the Church, as the Papists do of *Peter*: but they do not deny other men to be the Rocks, in that sense mentioned to *Bellarmins* third reason now mentioned. And thus much of *Origines.*

Another of the Fathers, one of *Bellarmins* great confidence, is *Cyprianus*; who in his 27. Epistle, after he hath mentioned how Christ said to *Peter*, *Thou art* Peter, *&c. And I will give unto thee the keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven.* He deduceth the Ordination of Bishops from these words, and the Government of the Church: *Ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constituatur, & omnis actus Ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur.* Here *Pamelius* himself acknowledgeth that *Cyprian* applyeth that promise of Christ, *Upon this Rock I will build my* Church, to every Bishop, and consequently when *Cyprianus* calls *Peter* the Rock; he cannot mean the only Rock, or that *Peter* is Oecumenick Bishop.

Pamelius

Pamelius anſwers, Albeit in this place *Cyprianus* applyeth that promiſe of Chriſt, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church* to all Biſhops; yet, Epiſt. 55. he applyeth it only to *Peter*. But it is replyed, although it be true, that *Cyprianus*, Epiſt. 55: makes mention only of *Peter*; yet it doth not follow he doth apply it only to *Peter*: it is falſe that *Cyprianus* affirms, epiſt. 55. that it can be applyed to no other then *Peter*: ſince himſelf in this place, epiſt. 27. applyeth it to every Apoſtle or Biſhop.

The third Father is *Auguſtinus*, *Epiſt*, 165. affirming, that when Chriſt directed thoſe words to *Peter*, *Peter* repreſented by Figure the whole Church: which he explains further, tract. 124. upon *John*, where after a long diſput he concluds, that the promiſe of Chriſt was made to the whole Church: whereby it evidently appears, that *Peter* in thoſe words is not ordained Oecumenick Biſhop, or the only Rock. In the ſame ſenſe *Hilarius*, on *Pſalm* 67. calls all the Apoſtles *foundations*: ſo *Theodoretus* and *Remigius*, on *Pſalm* 87. interpret thoſe words, *fundamenta ejus in montibus ſanctis*, of all the Apoſtles and Prophets: likewiſe the Apoſtle *Paul*, *Epheſ.* 2. 20. calleth all the Apoſtles and Prophets *foundations* and *Rocks*. So the Apoſtle *John* ſeems to call them *Apocall.* 21. By which it is evident, that thoſe Fathers calling *Peter Rock* or *Foundation*, attributs no peculiar thing to him; which is not common to others: and conſequently they mean nothing leſs by ſuch expreſſions, then that he is Oecumenick Biſhop.

Thoſe teſtimonies ſo evident, put *Bellarmin* to his wits end. Let us hear and examine an admirable piece of Sophiſtry.

Bellarmin, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 11. *De Pont. Rom.* anſwers, that all the Apoſtles may be called foundations three wayes. The firſt is, becauſe they were the firſt who founded Churches every where. The ſecond is, becauſe the Chriſtian Doctrine was re-

revealed to them all, by God. The third way is, by reason of their governing the Church, they were all Heads, Pastors, and Rectors of the Church: but in the first two wayes, all the Apostles were alike with *Peter*, Foundations and Rocks of the Church. Not in the third way; for although they had all *Plenitudinem potestatis*, *plenitude of power*, yet they had it only as Apostles and Legats: *Peter* had that power as ordinar Pastor, being head of the other Apostles upon whom they depended: and this was the thing promised to *Peter*, in those words, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.*

But it is answered, Nothing can be more absurd, more contradictory, or more entangling, then this distinction of *Bellarmins*. We said before that the truth of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* depended upon the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, it again upon the Supremacy of *Peter*, the principal ground of which Supremacy, is, that promise of Christ, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.* The sense of those words conferring the Supremacy upon *Peter*, depends upon this gloss, put upon those words by *Bellarmin*, which is both against Antiquity and Reason; and therefore we may conclude that the truth of the Doctrine of the Modern Church of *Rome*, depends upon the fantastick gloss of a *Jesuit*, contradicting all Antiquity, and inconsistent with it self. And first, it is against Antiquity, because they cannot give one instance from ancient Interpreters, Councils, and Fathers, giving this gloss upon those words of our Savior, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church:* neither was this gloss ever heard of, or so much as dreamed of, before the times of the *Jesuits*, after the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* was openly assaulted. Secondly, this gloss is contradictory to it self. By it *Bellarmin* intangles himself many ways: and first, he grants that all the Apostles were equally Rocks and Foundations with *Peter*, if the word *Foundation* be taken

in

in the first two senses. But all the Fathers who expone the Apostles to be foundations, and *Peter* among the rest, did not so much as dream of any other way, why *Peter* or they are called Foundations, but only of the first two, *viz.* in regard that they all alike founded Churches, preaching that doctrine revealed unto them all alike, immediatly from God: and consequently *foundation* in *Bellarmins* third sense is a dream of his own, by which he may well confirm his disciples, he will never convert Proselytes, but expose himself to the ludibrious taxings of his adversaries in making his own groundless fiction the main *Basis* of the supremacy of *Peter*; & consequently, of the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* (and consequently of the Religion of the *Modern* Church of *Rome*: to which all must be conform, under pain of damnation, according to that new article coined by the Council of *Trent*: adding to that Article of the *Creed*, *Catholick Church*, making it *Catholick Roman Church*.

Secondly, we have shewed, That this third way of Foundation is a fiction of *Bellarmins*, not dreamed of by the Ancients; which although it be sufficient to refute it, yet it refutes it self by many contradictions: And first, of other Popish Doctors: It gives unto all the Apostles *plenitudinem potestatis*, *plenitude of power*, in which it contradicts the *Theologick Dictionary* of *Altenstaing* approved by authority of the Church of *Rome*: In which Dictionar, *Plenitudo potestatis*, is defined not only to be *ordinis*, but also, *Jurisdictionis*, conferred by Christ only upon *Peter*, and his Successors: and that now *formaliter & subjectivè*; it is only in the Bishop of *Rome*: which is expresly contradicted by *Bellarmin*, who attributs it to all the Apostles, pressed by the evident testimonies of those Fathers, seeing the gloss of that Dictionar to be against all Antiquity.

Thirdly, Though *Bellarmin* be more sound then the gloss

of that Dictionar; in attributing to all the Apostles that plenitude of power; yet he contradicts himself, in giving to *Peter* a greater power then they had: it fleeth the edge of the quickest reason, to conceive any power greater then *plenitude of power*: and therefore it is a flat contradiction to affirme that although all the Apostles have *plenitude of power*, yet they depend upon *Peter*, as their *head*: which is as much to say, as all the Apostles have that power, then which none can have a greater: and yet *Peter* hath a greater power then they.

Lastly, *Bellarmin* affirms that *Peter* hath *plenitude* of *power*, as ordinar Pastor; the other Apostles as extraordinar and Legats to *Peter*: in which he intangles himself in a twofold contradiction. For to omit that distinction of ordinar and extraordinar Pastor amongst the Apostles, is a fiction of his own (the whole stream of Antiquity avowing all the Apostles to be extraordinar Pastors, *Peter* as well as the rest) First, he makes the other Apostles above *Peter*; since extraordinar Pastors are preferred to ordinar Pastors; the Apostle *Paul* enumerating the hierarchy of the Church, *Ephes.* 4 puts extraordinar Pastors in the first place, *viz.* Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists, before Pastors and Doctors: and so he contradicts himself, in affirming, that extraordinar Pastors depend upon *Peter*, as their *head*, whom he maketh ordinar Pastor.

Secondly, He contradicts himself in making the other Apostles Legats to *Peter*, and to omit, he doth so without any ground (having no authority, but his own assertion) he intangleth himself in his reason: for he hath no other reason wherefore the other Apostles are Legats to *Peter*: but only because the word Ἀπόστολος *Apostle*, in the original imports one who is sent in commission: which is all one with a Legat. But *Bellarmin* will not deny, that *Peter* in that sense is a Legat also, because he is an Apostle; and so *Peter* will be Legat

Legat to *Peter*, which is perfect none-ſenſe, and contradiction.

Bellarmin borrowed this diſtinction of ordinar and extraordinar from *Sanderus*, that famous *Engliſh Jeſuit* (who with his Country-man *Stapleton* invented more new diſtinctions to uphold the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, then all the Doctors of the Church beſide) *Sanderus* proves *Peter* to be ordinar, and the other Apoſtles to be extraordinar, *lib. 6. cap. 9.* of his *Monarchy*. Thus,

Ordinar is called ſo from *order*, but in *order*, that is firſt which is moſt ancient; ſince nothing can be firſt, before that which is firſt: but *Peter* was the firſt, upon whom Chriſt promiſed *to build his Church*; *and to give him the power of the keys*: *Ergo*, they were given to *Peter* alone. For albeit afterwards they were given to all the Apoſtles; yet Chriſt did not revock what he had given firſt to *Peter*: and therefore *Peter* is ordinar Paſtor, and the other Apoſtles extraordinar.

But it is anſwered, This argument of *Sanderus* preſuppons many things as granted, which are either uncertain, or notoriouſly falſe. Secondly, albeit his ſuppoſitions were true, they do not conclude his aſſertion, that *Peter* is ordinar Paſtor, having Juriſdiction over the reſt, as extraordinar: He who would ſee how that *Sophiſtry* of *Sanderus* is retexed at large, let him read *Chameir*, *tom. 2. lib. 11. cap. 6. num. 27.* to the end of the chapter, the ſubſtance of which is this.

Firſt, He ſuppons, that as *Ordinar*, which is firſt; that *extraordinar* which is laſt. But *ordinar* is taken (among Divines, ſpeaking of Church Officers) for that Office which is perpetual: extraordinar, for that which is for a time. So in the *Old Teſtament*, *Prieſts* and *Levits* were ordinar, *Prophets* extraordinar Officers: and under the *New Teſtament*; *Biſhops*, *Preſbyters*, and *Deacons*, and *Doctors*, are ordinar Officers; *Apoſtles*, *Evangeliſts* extraordinar.

Secondly, Though the diſtinction of *Sanderus*, in that ſenſe

sense of ordinar and extraordinar were granted; his assertion is uncertain, yea rather notoriously false: he supposes that *Peter* first obtained the power, of *binding*, *loosing*, and *feeding the Flock of Christ*: but that is uncertain; for these words of Christ exhibit nothing to *Peter* for the present, but only promise to give him that *power of the Keys*, and *to build his Church upon him*: neither was that promise made to *Peter* alone, but to all the Apostles; as partly hath been proved already, but more fully shal be proved, *cap.* 6. and 9. and therefore the supposition of *Sanderus* is uncertain and false.

Thirdly, Albeit his supposition were true, it is inconsequent, and proves nothing: for albeit our Savior had exhibited first to *Peter*, the performance of those promises, or *the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*: it doth not follow that *Peter* was ordinar *head* and *Pastor* of the other Apostles, having Jurisdiction over them: and that they were extraordinar, depending upon *Peter* as their *head*: as is declared by this similitude, a Colledge of Judges consisting of such a number, have afterwards more added to their number: it doth not follow, that those who were first constituted, are ordinar Judges, and the others extraordinar; much less, that those who were first constituted, have Jurisdiction over those who were last: which is most evident in the common wealth of the *Romans*, in which at first there were only four *Pontifices*, but that number was after doubled: at first, only a hundreth *Senators* under the Kings, but that number was tripled by *Brutus*, and augmented almost infinitly by Emperors. At first, there was only one *Prætor*, next, two, one for the City, an other for Strangers: Lastly, every Province had a *Prætor*. But none will deny that those *Pontifices*, *Senators*, *Prætors*, had as much power as those who were last constitut

conſtitut. And this much of thoſe Fathers interpreting the Rock to be *Peter*.

CHAP. VII.

Tu es Petrus, Diſputed from the Teſtimonies of Popiſh Doctors and Pops themſelves.

IN the former chapters we have diſputed, *Tu es Petrus*, (the principal foundation of the ſupremacy of *Peter*, of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and Faith of the Modern Roman Church) by reaſon & antiquity: of which our adverſaries brag ſo much, eſpecially of antiquity. Now we will examine the expoſition of thoſe words, by the teſtimonies of Pops, and Popiſh Doctors, interpreting that promiſe of *Chriſt*, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church*. So that by *Rock* is not meaned *Peter* at all, or at leaſt *Peter* alone: by which two things will appear, that the expoſition of thoſe words, *ſuper hanc Petram*, approved by the Modern Church of *Rome*, as an article of Faith, is againſt all Antiquity, and a new deviſed cheat of late, to eſtabliſh the Supremacy of *Peter*, the Biſhop of *Rome*, neceſſar communion with that Church by an implicit faith, as articles of the Creed neceſſar unto Salvation. The ſecond thing that will appear is this, they brag much of Unity and Concord among themſelves; but it will appear by this chapter, that there is no greater diſcord in hell, then is among thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, taxing one another of madneſs and hereſie, in the interpretation of thoſe words, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church*: which words are the principal, if not the only foundation of the Modern Roman Faith: and it is to be obſerved, that thoſe who interpret the *Rock* to be *Peter* only, and tax others of their own profeſſion of herſie, are but of yeſterday, in compariſon of the others who deny it; and ſince thoſe others who deny it, are alſo but of yeſterday, in compariſon

of

of Antiquity; it is evident, that this interpretation of *Peter* alone being the *Rock* is a new devised cheat to establish the tyranny of the Bishop of *Rome*, not known to the Ancients.

We shewed in the former chapters, that some of the Fathers interpreted the Rock to be Christ, *cap* 4. Others the faith of *Peter*, *cap.* 5. and those who interpreted the Rock to be *Peter*, meaned nothing less, then he was the only Rock; and in these words ordained Oecumenick Bishop. We will distinguish the testimonies of those following Pops, and Popish Doctors in three Classes accordingly: the first is, of those intepreting the Rock to be Christ. The second, of those interpreting it the confession of *Peter*. The third of those denying *Peter* to be the only Rock, of which in order.

The testimonies of the first class are those following; *Gregorius* Bishop of *Rome*, in *Job*, *lib.* 31. *cap.* 19. *in sacro eloquio cum singulari numero Petra nominatur, quis alius quàm Christus accipitur? Paulo attestante, qui ait, Petra erat Christus.* This testimony of a Bishop of *Rome*, and a Saint in the Roman Calendar is unanswerable, proving that in his time, the *Rock* was expounded not to be *Peter*, but Christ alone: which he not only affirms, but proves by this reason, *viz.* when ever *Rock* is mentioned in Scripture in the singular number, none other is to be understood but Christ: and whereas those Sophisters object, that *Gregorius* is not speaking of those words of Christ, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church*, because he proves it by the words of *Paul*, the Rock was Christ, who is speaking of that Rock, from which *Moses* made water issue. It is answered, Albeit that be true, that *Paul* is only speaking of that Rock yet it is false, that *Gregory* speaks only of that Rock: his words are, *where ever in Scripture Rock is mentioned in the singular number, it signifieth none but Christ.* But in these words of our Savior, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church.* *Rock* is mentioned in the singular number, *Ergo*, according to

Grego-

Gregorius the *Rock* in theſe words is only Chriſt, and not *Peter* at all.

The ſecond teſtimony is of *Anſelmus*, who lived in the 12. Century, who writing upon theſe words, ſpeaks as followeth, *Super hanc Petram, ideſt, Super me ædificabo Eccleſiam meam. Quaſi dicat: ſuper Petrum à me Petra, ut tamen mihi reſervetur fundamenti dignitas. Sed tu, cui ego amatori, & confeſſori meo Participium mei nominis dedi, Super me fundamentum mundos lapides ordinabis.* This teſtimony is alſo moſt evident, in which Chriſt is expreſly interpreted to be the *Rock*, and *Peter* denyed to be the *Rock*. All which is given to *Peter*, is, to build the faithful upon Chriſt as the *Rock*: viz. by preaching and ſealing the Goſpel with his blood as was ſhewed before.

Lyranus upon the ſame words, *Et ſuper hanc Petram, quam confeſſus es, id eſt ſuper Chriſtum.* In which words he expreſly interprets the *Rock* to be Chriſt. He lived, *anno* 1320. whereby it appears it was no article of Faith in his dayes to interpret the *Rock* to be *Peter*.

The Interlinear Gloſs upon *Matthew* 16. 18. *Petram id eſt, Chriſtum in quem credis*: That is, *by Rock is meaned Chriſt in whom Peter believed*: but this Gloſs was approved by the whole Church.

Ioannes Arboreus Theoſoph. lib. 5. *cap.* 5. *Eccleſia fundata eſt ſuper Petram, & non ſuper Petrum.* The Church is built upon the *Rock*, and not upon *Peter*.

Petrus de Alliaco Cardinalis, in Recommend. ſacræ Scripturæ, he lived, *anno* 1400. his teſtimony in the ſaid place is this; *Non videtur quod in Petra Petrus, ſed in Petra Chriſtus ſit intelligendus, de quo agit Apoſtolus, Petra autem erat Chriſtus. It is not like that the Church is founded upon the Rock Peter, but upon the Rock Chriſt, as the Rock is taken by the Apoſtle Paul,* when he affirmeth the *Rock was Chriſt*. The ſame Author, *lib.* 2.

cap. 13. of his concordance, *Per Petram Christum, quem confessus est, intelligimus*, *by the Rock we understand Christ whom Peter confessed.*

Pererius, *lib.* 2. in *Daniel*, although a Jesuit affirms, *Quia Christus est Petra, super quam fundata est & sustentatur Ecclesia: ideoque nullo unquam tempore, nullâque vi labefactari & everti poterit: quin imò, nec portæ inferi adversus eam prævalebunt.* In which words he gives a reason, wherefore the gates of hell shal not prevail against the Church; *viz.* because Christ is the Rock upon which it is built: And thus much of the testimonies of those Popish Doctors, interpreting the *Rock* to be Christ. And since some of them lived very lately, it is evident, that the interpretation of the Rock to be *Peter*, is but a new devised cheat. Now followeth the second Class.

Of those Popes and Popish Doctors interpreting the Rock to be the Faith or Confession of *Peter*. The first testimony is of *Adrianus Primus*, who lived in the eighth Century, *Anno* 772. or thereabouts; who in his Epistle to the Bishops of *Spain* and *France*, recorded in the Acts of the Council of *Frankfoord*, hath these words: *Super hanc Petram, quam confessus es, & à qua vocabuli sortitus es dignitatem, super hanc soliditatem fidei Ecclesiam meam ædificabo.* By which words two things appear. The first is, That the Church is built in his opinion, upon the Confession of *Peter*. The second is, That those who call the Rock Christ, and those who call it the confession of *Peter*, mean both one thing: since he expresly affirms, That the *Rock* is ——— the objective Confession of Peter, or — that which *Peter* confessed, *viz.* Christ, which is all one, as if he had called Christ the Rock.

The second testimony of *Innocent third*, who lived Anno 1200. or thereabouts. In his Epistle to the Bishop of *France*, concerning *Petrus Abeilardus*, which Epistle is mentioned by

Otto

Otto Friſingenſis, lib. 1. *cap* 84. *degeſtis Frederici primi Beatus Petrus Apoſtolorum Princeps, pro eximiâ hujus fidei confeſſione audire meruit, Tu es, inquam, beatus Petrus, & ſuper hanc Petram ædificabo Eccleſiam meam: Petram utique firmitatem fidei, & Catholicæ unitatis ſoliditatem manifeſtè deſignans*: The ſum of which words is, that our Savior, by *hanc Petram*, or the Rock, means the firmneſs and ſolidity of *Peters* Faith.

The third teſtimony is of *Adrianus quintus*, Biſhop of *Rome*, who lived about 1278. in his epiſtle to *Frederick* the Emperor, recorded by *Radivicus Friſingenſis*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 3. *Quem in Apoſtolicæ Confeſſionis Petra non ambigimus per Dei gratiam ſolidatum*; where the Rock is expreſly called the thing which *Peter* confeſſed.

The teſtimony of the fourth Biſhop of *Rome* is of *Nicolaus ſecundus*, who lived about *anno* 1060. His teſtimony is recorded by *Gratianus*, *Diſtinct.* 22. *cap.* 1. *Romanam Eccleſiam ſolus ille ædificavit, & ſuper Petram fidei mox naſcentis erexit*, that is, the Church was built upon the faith of *Peter*, then budding.

And thus much of the teſtimonies of four Popes or Biſhops of *Rome* interpreting the rock to be the faith of *Peter*: to which may be added teſtimonies of the moſt learned Doctors of that Church, as the Gloſſator of the *Decreta*, *diſtinct.* 19. *cap. Ita Dominus Joannes de Turre Cremata*, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 102. *&* 112. *in ſumma de Eccleſia. Dionyſius Carthuſianus*, who lived 1460. in his Commentaries upon *Matthew* 16. 18. *Gorranus* upon the ſame place, and alſo *Titelemannus* and *Eraſmus*; all which expreſly interpret the *rock* to be the confeſſion of *Peter*: it is needleſs to ſet down their words, ſince their teſtimonies are granted.

The third Claſs of Popiſh Doctors is of thoſe, who, although *Peter* were granted to be the *rock*, yet they deny him to be the only *rock*, upon which the

Church was built: and who call other Apostles rocks and foundations as well as *Peter*. The testimonies are few, but the givers of them are most notable Men: the most famous Doctors that ever the Church of *Rome* could brag of. The first is the testimony of *Lombardus*, Master of the sentences, the first Founder of School-divinity among the *Latins*, as *Damascenus* amongst the *Grecians*: who interpreting those words of *Psalm* 87. *Fundamenta ejus in montibus sanctis*, affirms, that all the Prophets and Apostles are foundations.

The second testimony is of *Nicolaus Cusanus*, that famous *Cardinal*, whom *Espensæus*, *lib.* 2. *de adorat. Ecclesiæ*, and *Æneas Silvius* afterward Bishop of *Rome*, both commend as one of the ablest Divines that ever the Church of *Rome* produced. His first testimony is 21. *dist. in novo* 24. *quest.* 1. *Sed scimus quod* Petrus *nihil plus potestatis à Christo accepit aliis Apostolis*; but we know that *Peter* got no more power from Christ then the rest of the Apostles: and likewise, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 13. *concordiæ Catholicæ*, where he hath this notable testimony, *Et quanquam* Petro *dictum esset*, *tues* Petrus, ——*Si* Petrus *per* Petram *lapis fundamenti Ecclesiæ intelligi deberet*, *tunc secundum* S. *Hieronymum ita similiter alii Apostoli fuerunt lapides*, *Apocal.* 21. In which words he expressly affirms, and proves that the other Apostles were *Rocks* as well as *Peter*, which he proves by the testimony of *Hieronymus*.

And thus much of that famous passage, *tu es* Petrus, of which so much noise is made now a days: which although it be the principal place upon which the supremacy of *Peter*, of the Bishop of *Rome*, and the Faith of the *Modern Church* of *Rome* is built: Yet you see what little cause they have to brag of Antiquity; since none of the Ancients interpret *Peter* to be the *Rock*; and also what little cause they have to brag of Unity, since those who interpret *Peter* to be the

Rock

Rock only, are contradicted not only by the most learned Doctors of their own Church, but also by six Popes, *Felix* 3. *Gregory* 1. *Adrianus* 1. *Nicolaus* 2. *Innocentus* 3. *Adrianus* 5. And notwithstanding that their Popes are now esteemed by them infallible Judges of controversies, yet *Pighius* and *Baronius*, who interpret the *Rock* to be Peter only, tax all those six Popes of ignorance, madness, as we said before: so doth *Maldonatus de Valentia*, and other of their Doctors, whose testimonies is needless to be mentioned, since they cannot without impudence be denyed.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Matthew 16. 19. *Of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.*

HItherto hath been prolixly disputed, the first argument of our adversaries, proving *Peter* to be Oecumenick Bishop: *viz.* because (as they pretend) our Savior promised to *build the Church upon him as a Rock*, *verse* 18. Now followeth their second argument, *viz* because our Savior promised to give to him *the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, *verse* 19. But it is unanimously answered by *Protestants*, that in those words, *the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, our Savior doth not mean *universal Jurisdiction over the Church*: And lest it should seem to be a wilful denyal, they give these following reasons, why *Peter* is not ordained Oecumenick Bishop in these words? Or why *the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, infer no universal Jurisdiction over the Church in the person of *Peter* alone? The first reason is this, the *power of the keys* is only a *forgiving or remitting of sins*, *or not remitting them*: *or a binding and loosing*, as appears by the testimony of *Augustinus* in his 52. *Treatise* upon *John*; of *Theophylactus* on *Matthew* 16. 19.

of

of *Anselmus*, *ibid.* But none calls in question, but *binding* and *loosing*, is a different thing from the power of an Oecumenick Bishop.

Bellarmin instances, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 13. *de pont. Rom.* that the *keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, is universal Jurisdiction over the whole Church: which he proves by three arguments. The first is, from the Metaphor of keyes, *Isaiah* 22. where *Shebna* is threatned *to have the keys of the Temple taken from him, to be given to Eliakim*: that is, saith *Bellarmin*, *the government of the Temple, or of the house of God.*

But it is answered, *Bellarmin* is greatly mistaken; for, according to the *Hebrew*, *Shebna* was not *Prefect* of the *Temple*, but only of the Kings house: *Bellarmin* is deceived by the *Latin* version, turning it *Tabernacle*, whereas *Aben Ezra* calls it, *Master of the Kings house*, the *Septuagints*, ταμιευτην, and they call *Shebna*, ταμιαν, that is, *Treasaurer*, or *Master-household*: that is the true interpretation, as appears by *Kings* 2. *cap.* 18. in which place *Eliakim* (who succeeded to *Shebna* in that charge) is called by the *Septuagints*, οικονομος, *œconomus*, or *Master-household*; *Shebna* is called there a *Scribe*; which place he obtained after the keys of the Kings house were taken from him, and given to *Eliakim*. However it is a very bad argument of *Bellarmins*, When *Shebna* had the keys of the Kings house, *the government of the house was taken from him, when they were taken away*: Ergo, *When Peter got the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven from Christ, he was made sole governor of the whole Church.* *Bellarmin* should observe, that keys are given sometimes by an Inferior to a Superior: & although that be but a new invention or ceremony, yet it is an acknowledgement of authority; as when a King entring a Town, the keys are delivered to him: But when keys are given by a Superior to an Inferior, chief Jurisdiction is no wayes denoted. But *Bellarmin* will not deny that Christ

was

was Superior to *Peter* ? And whereas it is objected, *that Chriſt hath the key of David* in the *Apocalyps*, that is juriſdiction of the Church. It is anſwered, the caſe is different: none calls the juriſdiction of Chriſt in queſtion, neither had he the keys from any greater then himſelf.

Bellarmins ſecond argument is, That the keys import *binding* and *looſing*: that is, *inflicting of puniſhment, and diſpenſing with obligations of the Law*; which is ſupream Juriſdiction over the Church: And conſequently, *Peter* in theſe words is inſtituted Oecumenick Biſhop.

But it is anſwered, That *binding* and *looſing* import no ſupream Juriſdiction, as appears by its being common to all the Officers of the Church as well as to *Peter*: it conſiſts in *bidding, forbidding, puniſhing by Spiritual Cenſures, and Relaxations from them*; which are common to all Church-Officers, as ſhal immediatly be proved.

In the third place, *Bellarmin* proves that our Savior, promiſing to *Peter* the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, promiſed to him alone the government of the whole Church, by the teſtimonies of Fathers. The firſt teſtimony of *Chryſoſtomus, hom.* 55. on *Matthew*, affirming, *that to Peter the whole world was committed, and that he was made head and Paſtor of the whole Church.*

But it is anſwered, It is falſe, that either *Chryſoſtomus* affirms, *the whole world was committed to* Peter, or, *that he was head of the Church*: *Bellarmin* followeth the corrupt verſion of *Trapezuntius*, in which he ſophiſticats manifoldly: the words of *Chryſoſtom* are (comparing *Hieremas* with *Peter*) *Quemadmodum pater* Hieremam *alloquens dixit: Inſtar columnæ aneæ, & muri poſui eum: ſed illum quidem unigenti: hunc vero toti orbi*: In theſe words *Chryſoſtomus* is comparing the *Prophet* with *Peter*, as the Lord (ſaith he) *put Hieremas as*

a

a wall of brass to one Nation, viz. the *Jews*: *So Peter was made a wall of brass to the whole world.* But *Chrysostom* speaks not a word of *Hieremias* being set over the *Jews* with Jurisdiction; and consequently, if the comparison hold, *Peter* was not set over the whole world with Jurisdiction: which is the first sophistry of *Bellarmin*, following *Trapezuntius*, in stead of τίνα ἀντὶ, *posuit eum*, *placed him*. *Trapezuntius* renders, *præposuit*, *set him over*, which is not in the *Appodesis* of *Peter*. The second corruption is, that *Trapezuntius* adds of his own, *Cujus caput piscator homo*, *whose head was a Fisher-man*: It is true indeed, a little before these words, *Chrysostom* calls *Peter* *Pastor of the Church*; but that's nothing to an Oecumenick Bishop: for any Apostle may be called Pastor of the Church, as shal be proved afterwards in this Book.

Bellarmins second testimony is of *Gregorius Magnus*, *lib.* 4. *Epist.* 31. Where speaking of *Peter* he affirms, *the care of the whole* Church *was committed to him*, *and that he was* Prince *of the Apostles*. But it is answered, In what sense *Gregorius* affirms, so shal be shewed at length hereafter; where it shal be proved first, that others were called *Princes of the Apostles* beside *Peter*: and that the care of the whole Church was committed to others also who were not Oecumenick Bishops.

Secondly, the impudence of *Bellarmin* is very great, in objecting this place of *Gregorius*, in which he is thundering with great execrations, and detestation against any, who taketh upon him the tittle of Oecumenick Bishop; *calling that tittle new*, *Pompatick*, *Blasphemous against the mandats of Christ*, *the Canons of the Apostles*, *and Constitutions of the Church*: And among other reasons against that title of universal Oecumenick Bishop, he objects this as one: *If any took upon him that tittle*, *Peter had reason to take it: but he had not that tittle*, *although the care of the whole Church was committed to him*: then this impudence

dence of *Bellarmin* no greater can be imaginable: *Gregory* expresly denyes it to follow, that *Peter was universal Apostle, or Bishop, although the care of the whole Church was committed to him: Bellarmin* mutilats his passage, and makes him conclude, *that Peter was universal Apostle or Bishop, because the care of the whole Church was committed to him.* He cites this part of *Gregories* assertion, *the care of the whole Church was committed to Peter*: but he suppresseth the other half of his assertion, *that Peter was not universal Apostle,* and most impudently fathers a contradictory conclusion upon *Gregory*; *Ergo, Peter was Oecumenick Bishop.* And thus much of the first reason, wherefore Protestants deny, that the power of the keyes imports no universal Jurisdiction of *Peter* alone over the Church.

Their second reason is this, Because *the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven* were given to others besides *Peter*, which they prove; First by Scripture, next by Fathers. The passages of Scripture are two. The first is, *Mat.* 18. 18. *Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shal bind on earth, shal be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye loose on earth, shal be loosed in heaven.* The second place is in *Joh.* 20. 23. *Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained.*

Bellarmin answers, That those two places now cited have not the same meaning with *Matthew* 16. 19. He grants that the difficulty is somewhat pressing of *Matthew* 18. 18. but there is no difficulty at all (saith he) in *John* 20. 23. which he proves by three Arguments. The first is this in *Matthew* 16. 19. *The Keyes are promised to Peter without any particular determination, but in John, they are determinated to the forgivenes of sins: but binding and loosing may be exercised in other objects, then in pronouncing men guilty of sin, or absolving them from sin, as in making of laws, and dispensing with them.*

But it is answered, That the Fathers expounding those words, *What ever ye shal bind on earth, &c. Matthew* 16. 19.

referrs that place only to the binding and loosing of sin. So *Augustinus*, *tractat.* 124. on *John*. *Ecclesia, quæ fundatur in Christo, Claves ab ea regni Cœlorum accepit in Petro, id est, potestatem ligandi, solvendique peccata.* In which words he expressly affirms, That the keyes committed to *Peter*, consisted in the binding and loosing of sin.

Secondly *Theophylactus* on *Matthew* 16. expressly affirms, *What was given to Peter in that place, was given to all the Apostles*, *John* 20. He saith indeed, *They were promised only to Peter*, *Matthew* 16. (*Christ directing his speech only to Peter*) *but they were given to all: If ye ask when?* (saith he) *it is answered, when he said, Whose soever sins ye forgive*, alluding to *John* 20.

Whereas *Bellarmin* affirms, That the power of the keyes consists also in *making of Laws*, he saith nothing at all, except he prove that *Peter* had more authority then the other Apostles in that particular *of making Laws*.

Bellarmins second Argument, to prove the same thing is not promised to *Peter*, *Matthew* 16. which is given to the other Apostles, *John* 20. is this, in *Matthew* it is said to *Peter*, *Whomsoever thou shalt bind*, &c. But it is said to the other Apostles in *John*, *Whose soever sins ye retain*, &c. But *to bind*, is more then *to retain*; for, to *retain*, is to leave a man in the same condition ye find him; but to *bind*, is to impose new bonds upon him by excommunication, interdicting, and Law.

But it is answered, This Argument of *Bellarmins* is of no moment: because, according to the constant phrase of Scripture, *Forgiving of sins, and loosing of sins* are all one; *Ergo*, their opposits, *retaining of sin, binding a sinner* are all one. Since we bind men for their sins only, it is necessar, that the sin being forgiven, they are loosed: or else that they are still retained if they be not loosed. But it is absurd to affirm that anys sins are forgiven, and yet retained: for *Bellarmin* seems to speak

of

of that distinction, *viz. remission of fault*, and *remission of punishment*, that is, *the fault may be forgiven, but not the punishment*: But this distinction is vain, and belongs nothing to this place. *Bellarmin* seems to import, that the Prerogative of *Peter* is, *to have power of remitting any of them, or both of them, which the other Apostles have not*: wherein he is topped first by *Cyrillus*, upon *Matthew* 16. who attributs *the full power of binding and loosing to the whole Church*: which he proves in that instance of the incestuous Corinthian. Secondly, he is topped by *Aquinas*, affirming that *every Minister binds in refusing the Sacrament of the Church to those who are unworthy, and looseth, when he admits them to it.* Thirdly, the Interlinear Gloss upon *Matthew* 16. affirms that sins are forgiven and retained by two keyes of *power* and *remission*.

Bellarmins third argument, proving that *John* 20. and *Matthew* 16. are not alike, is this; because, saith he, in *John* 20. *Power of forgiving sins, by the Sacrament of Baptism or Penitence is only conferred upon the Apostles*: which he proveth by the authority of *Chrysostom*, and *Cyrillus* upon this place, *John* 20. and also of *Hieronymus*, *Quest.* 9. *ad Hedibia*.

But it is answered, First, Those Fathers affirm indeed, that *Power of forgiving of sins in Baptism is given in this place*: but it is false which *Bellarmin* affirms, that it is only given and no more. For *forgiving of sins is but the half of the Power* conferred by Christ upon the Apostles in this place; since *retaining of sins* is also given unto them. Secondly, Fathers referr to Baptism that *loosing* given to *Peter*, *Matthew* 16. So *Cyprianus*, *epistle* 73. where he disputs, *that forgiving of sins in Baptism is proper to the Pastors of the Church*: which he proves, first, by *Peter* who got that power, *Matthew*, 16. 19. and also by the other Apostles, to whom our Savior said. *Whose sins ye forgive*, &c. *John* 20. Yea *Gaudentius*, in the first day of his ordination, expressly affirms, that *the gates of the Kingdom of*

heaven are opened no other wayes, then by Baptism and absolution: and thus much of the similitude of *John* 20. with *Matthew* 16. By what we have said, it appears that *Bellarmin* brings nothing but Sophistry to prove that the places are not alike.

He grants that there is great difficulty to prove the dissimilitude of *Matthew* 16. 19. and 18. 18. Since *binding and loosing* is given to all the Apostles in the last place as well as in the first to *Peter*, and not only *retaining*, as in *John* 20. which *Bellarmin* affirmed to be a demonstration, that *John* 20. and *Matthew* 16. were not alike places, *viz.* that *retaining and forgiving* was only given to all the Apostles, *John* 20 which was not so much as *binding and loosing* given to *Peter*, *Matthew* 16. Nevertheless, *Bellarmin* endeavors to prove that, *Matthew* 16. 19. and 18. 18. are unlike places: although in the last *binding and loosing* be given to all the Apostles as well as to *Peter* in the first: Because that *binding and loosing* given to *Peter*, *Matthew* 16. is of greater authority, then that given to the other Apostles, *Matthew* 18. 18 His argument is this, which I believe he understands not himself.

In *Matthew* 18. (saith he) Nothing is given to the Apostles at all, but only it is promised to them, and explained what power they should have afterward? which he proves by two reasons. The first is, That they were not yet *Priests* or *Pastors*, or *Bishops*, when Christ made them that promise, *Matthew* 18. 18. but only after the resurrection. Secondly, because those words, *Whomsoever ye shal bind and loose*, &c. *Matthew* 18. are the paralels of those said to *Peter*, *Whatsoever thou shalt bind or loose*, *Matthew* 16. But in *Matthew* 16. nothing was exhibited to *Peter*, but only promised: *Ergo*, in *Matthew* 18. nothing was exhibited to the other Apostles.

It is answered, That *Bellarmin* proves nothing but what he affirmed before, *viz.* *That it was hard to shew a disparity between these two places*: Or that *binding* and *loosing*, *Matthew*

thew 16. 19. and *Matthew* 28. 18. for in ſtead of proving them different places, by his ſophiſtical contradictory babling, he proves they are juſt the ſame: For firſt he grants, that *nothing was exhibited in either place, but only promiſed.* Secondly, he grants that the words are alike, *Whatſoever thou ſhalt bind*, and *whatſoever ye ſhal bind*: Whence he concluds *that the places are not alike*; whereas he demonſtrats they are the ſame. It is reaſoning unbeſeeming ſo brave a man to prove places not alike by alike circumſtances in both. Secondly, he contradicts what he ſaid before, *viz. That power of Order was only given unto the other Apoſtles*, John 20. but *power of Juriſdiction to Peter*, *Matthew* 16. and therefore the places were unlike, that *power of order* was only given to the other Apoſtles, *John* 20. he proved by *forgiving* and *retaining*: that *power of Juriſdiction* was given to *Peter*, *Matthew* 16. he proves by *binding* and *looſing*: but here he grants that *the binding* and *looſing* given to the other Apoſtles, *Matthew* 18. and that given to *Peter Matthew* 16. are *verba ſimilia*, or the ſame words, and conſequently, that the *keys or power of Juriſdiction* are given to the other Apoſtles as well as to *Peter*: and conſequently he proves himſelf a lyar, in affirming, that the *keys* given to *Peter*, were *keys of Juriſdiction*, but not theſe given to the other Apoſtles.

Alphonſus de Caſtro adverſus hareſ. lib. 12. and *Fiſher* Biſhop of *Rocheſter* diſputing againſt *Luther*, *art.* 25 proves that the *keys* given to *Peter*, *Matthew* 16. and theſe given to the other Apoſtles, *Matthew* 18. are not the ſame which they prove by an *Achillean* argument, *viz.* it is ſaid to *Peter*, *Whatever thou bindeſt and looſeſt on Earth, ſhal be bound and looſed in the* Heavens: but unto the other Apoſtles, *Matthew* 18 it is only ſaid, *Whomſoever ye bind or looſe on Earth, it ſhal be bound or looſed in* Heaven, *but to bind and looſe in* Heaven *is not the ſame, but leſs then to bind and looſe in the* Heavens.

But

But it is answered, Any intelligent person may see that those otherwise-learned men fight against their own conscience, when they are driven to uphold the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, by such childish babling: Since men of so great Spirits and Learning, as those two were known to be, could not be ignorant, that this distinction of *Heaven* and *Heavens*, is against Sense, Scripture, and Fathers.

First, it is against sense, Because none can be ignorant, that *Heavens in the plural number*, and *Heaven collectively in the singular number* are all one and the same thing, in the ordinar phrase of speaking: Who is so stupid as to deny it? Secondly, It is against Scripture, which promiscuously useth *Heaven* and *Heavens* in the same sense: so *Mark* 1. compared with *Luk.* 3. demonstrat. In the first place, it is said, *The Heavens were cloven assunder.* In the last, *the Heaven was opened*: and yet both the Evangelists are relating the same thing, when *John* the *Baptist* baptized our Savior. So, *Matthew* 6. Christ affirmeth, *Lay up treasures for your selves in Heaven*; but, *Luk.* 12. *Make your selves treasurs in the Heavens.* Thirdly, this distinction of *Heaven* and *Heavens*, is of so little moment in the opinion of the Fathers, that they express, *Matthew* 18. in the *plural number Heavens*, and *Matthew* 16. in the *singular number Heaven.* So *Hilarius*, *lib.* 6. *de Trinitate* affirms, That all the Apostles had the keys *Regni Cælorum* of the Heavens: he useth the same expression in his Book against the *Arrians*. *Cyprianus*, *epist.* 54. affirmeth that all the Apostles had power of *binding* and *loosing* in the *Heavens*: so doth *Chrysostomus*, *lib.* 3. *de Sacerdotio*, and *Isidorus Pelusiota*, *lib.* 2. *epist.* 5. and *Augustinus* against the Adversary of the Law and the Prophets, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 17. and *Paceanus*, *epist.* 1. to *Sympronianus*, and in his book against the *Novatians*. All which Fathers affirm, that the Apostles had power of *binding* and *loosing* in *Cælis*, in the *Heavens*. The school-men like.

likewise speak after the same manner, as *Lombardus, distinct.* 18. of the first chapter, *lib.* 4. and also in the same book, *distinct.* 19. and *Durandus, quest.* 1. in his Commentaries upon the said 19. *distinct.* This is it that proved that all the Apostles had the *keys* not only of *Heaven*, but of the *Heavens*, whereby it appears by the authority of Scripture, Fathers, and School-men, that the *keys of Heaven* and of *Heavens* are one and the same thing.

If any be not yet convinced, it is further proved they are the same, because the Fathers call the *keys* of *Peter*, *the keys of Heaven*, in the *singular number*: So *Ambrosius, lib* 1. *de penitentia, cap.* 6. and *Augustinus contra adversarium, lib.* 1. *cap.* 17. *Ambrosius* repeating the words of Christ to *Peter*, saith, *Quæcunque ligaveris super Terram, erunt ligata & in Cælo.*

Which is further confirmed, The Fathers in the same place speaking of Christs promise to *Peter*, call the *keys* promised to him, both the *keys of Heaven*, and the *keys of Heavens*. So *Ambrosius* in the now cited place, after the former words adds, *Et quæcunque solveris super Terram, erunt soluta & in Cælis. Augustinus* in the fore-cited place, calls the *keys* given to the other Apostles, both the *keys of Heaven*, and of the *Heavens*; for after those words (repeating our Saviors promise to the Apostles) *Qua solveritis super Terram, erunt soluta & in Cælis*, he affirms, *Qua ligaveritis in Terra, erunt ligata & in Cælo.* And thus we have proved that *Alphonsus de Castro*, and Bishop *Fisher* are mistaken in their distinction of *Heaven* and *Heavens*, by Reason, Scripture and Fathers.

The original of this distinction they have from *Origines, tract.* 6. in *Matthew*, where, comparing the *keys* of *Peter* with those words, *Tell the Church, and if he refuse to hear it, to make satisfaction after three admonitions, let him be unto thee as a publican*; he affirms, That *Peter, although but one*

person

person, yet had the keys of many Heavens, but others, *or those admonishers, three times; although many persons, yet had only the keys of one Heaven*: and so by the testimony of *Origines*, *Bozius*, *lib.* 18. *cap.* 1. *de signis Ecclesiæ*, sustains that distinction *of Heaven* and *Heavens* mentioned by *de Castro* and Bishop *Fisher*.

But it is answered, Those Doctors of the Church of *Rome* take great liberty to themselves, in exposition of the Fathers: *Bellarmin*, as we shewed before, pressed by a testimony of *Origen*, not only affirming, but also proving, that these words, *upon this Rock I will build my Church*: Or that in these words nothing was promised to *Peter*, which was not promised to the other Apostles, answered, that *Origines* was speaking allegorically, otherwise he contradicted himself in his 5. *Homily* upon *Exodus*; where he called *Peter* that *great Foundation*: which we proved to be no contradiction, *cap.* 6.

By the same argument we prove, that *Origines* in this place is speaking allegorically, otherwise he contradicts Reason, Scripture, Fathers, and himself: And likewise affirms a notorius untruth in this very place alledged. And first, that he contradicts Reason, Scripture, and Fathers, in denying the *keys of Heaven*, and the *keys of Heavens* to be the same, we have just now proved, disputing with *de Castro* and *Fisher*.

Secondly, He contradicts himself in other places, in affirming that greater power of the *keys* was given to *Peter* then to the Others, or that the *keys of the Heavens* are more then the *keys of Heaven*; because else-where he disputs and endeavors to prove, that the power of the *keys* given to *Peter* was the very same given to the other Apostles, as in his first Treatise upon *Matthew*, mentioned before, and vindicated, *cap.* 6.

Thirdly, *Origen* is comparing the *keys of Peter* with these *three admonitions*: but if he speak literally, he lyeth, in affirming

firming, that those Admonishers had the power of the *key of one Heaven* given them from Christ, or *that what they did bind and loose on Earth, should be bound and loosed in one Heaven*, which is promised no where by Christ.

Lastly, *Origines* is comparing in these words, the power of *Privat Admonishers*, with that of *Ministers*, having the power of binding and loosing; and after his manner falls to Allegories, by this distinction of *Heaven* and *Heavens*: otherwise he were not only a lyar in this place, but also a contradicter of Reason, Scripture, and other Fathers, and of himself in other places. *Bellarmin* thought it a sufficient Reason to prove that *Origines* spake allegorically, *viz. otherwise he would contradict himself*: and yet we shewed there was no contradiction; & therefore he cannot in reason deny that *Origines* in this place speaks allegorically, since otherwise he would contradict Reason, Scripture, all the Fathers, himself in other places, and also be a notorious lyar in this same alledged place?

We have have proved already, That *Matthew 16. 19.* inferrs not that *Peter* was Oecumenick Bishop, because the *power of the keys* was no universal Jurisdiction over the whole Church; we undertook to prove it by an other reason, *viz.* because the power of the *keys* was not given to *Peter* alone, but to the other Apostles as well as to him: Which we undertook to prove by two arguments. First, by Scripture. Secondly, by Fathers. By Scripture we have already proved it, *viz.* from *Matthew* 18. 18. and *John* 20. 23. vindicated from the exceptions of our adversaries, alledging they were not alike places with *Matthew 16. 19*, It only remains now, to prove by testimonies of Fathers, that the *keys of the Kingdom of Heaven* were given to others, as well as to *Peter*: those testimonies are of two sorts. The first is of those affirming directly that the *keys* were given to others besids *Peter*: the other sort is of those affirming it by consequence. Of the first sort it is

needless to mention any more, then we have already mentioned in the vindication of these places: Such as *Hilarius, lib. 6. de Trinitate*, and *adversus Arianos*, *Cyprianus Epistola* 54. *Chrysostomus, de Sacerdotio, lib.* 3. *Isidorus Pelusiota, lib.* 2. *epist.* 5. *Pacianus, ad Sympronianum, epist.* 1. and *in his Treatise against the Novatians.* All which testimonies expresly affirm, That the *keys* were given to others beside *Peter*: Neither is it needful to set down the words, since our adversaries cannot have so much impudence as to deny them: To which testimonies may be added, that of *Hieronymus* against *Jovinanus*, *Cuncti Discipuli claves Regni Cœlorum accipiunt, all the Disciples got the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*; of Origines, tract. 1. *in* Matthew. *An verò soli Petro dantur claves Regni cœlorum, nec alius beatorum quisquam eas accepturus est? Quod si dictum hoc, tibi dabo claves Regni Cœlorum, cæteris quoque commune est, cor non simul omnia communia?* In which words he expresly affirms, That which was promised to *Peter*, was promised also to all the Apostles, as well as *the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.* And a little after, *Servator dans Spiritum Sanctum Discipulis per insufflationem, ait, accipite Spiritum Sanctum & c.* It is needless to add any more testimonies. Now let us consider how our adversaries elude them.

And first, *Cardinal Pool in his defence of the Ecclesiastick Unity, lib.* 2. grants those testimonies, but he denys that any thing is proved by them; *viz. That all the Apostles had alike power with* Peter, *in the power of the keys, albeit it seems to be the meaning of those Fathers*: which he illustrats by the example of *Moses*, and the 70. *Elders*: since it is said, *Numbers* 11. *That God gave unto them a part of that Spirit which was in* Moses, *and consequently, they had the same power in substance with* Moses, *but not in so excellent a way.*

Maldonatus answers otherwise, *viz.* denying, *That the same keys were given to* Peter, *Matthew* 16. and to the

the other Apostles, *Matthew* 18. and *John* 20, his reason is, in the two last places, *no mention is made of keys at all.*

Stapleton is more subtile, for seeing that Christ saith, *Matthew* 18. *What ever ye shal bind*, to all the Apostles, is the same with that said to *Peter*, *Matthew* 16. *Whatsoever thou shalt bind, &c.* He grants that the same *binding* and *loosing* given to *Peter*, *Matthew* 16. is given to the other Apostles, *Matthew* 18. but he affirms, *That the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, are a thing different from either of the *bindings* or *loosings*, *in Relec. controvers. 3. quest. 1. art. 1. conclus. 4.*

Others answer, Distinguishing the *keys of Order and Jurisdiction*, they grant that the *keys of Order* were given to all the Apostles, *the keys of Jurisdiction* only to *Peter.*

It is needless, particularly to insist upon the refutation of those new devised Sophistries, to hold up the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*: they are quite and diametrally opposit to the meaning of all antiquity, of which they brag so much, as appears by two reasons. The first is, that the Fathers dispute expresly that the same *keys* were promised to *Peter*, *Matth.* 16. and to the other Apostles, *Mat.* 18. & *John* 20. & consequently, all those distinctions devised of late by the *Jesuits* & others, are nothing else but fantastick dreams, and sophistical evasions.

And first, *Origines*, *tract.* 1. on *Matthew*, disputs (as we said) *That the Church was built alike upon all the Apostles, because the keys were given alike to all the Apostles*: by which reasoning it appears, that he thought it a thing uncontroverted in his time, that the *keys* were common to all the Apostles, since he useth it as a *Medium* or *Argument* to prove, *That the Church was built upon all the Apostles, as well as upon* Peter.

Secondly, That the *keys* were common to all the Apostles, he proves by *John* 20, 23. whereby it is evident, that the said place is the same in meaning with *Matthew* 16. in which he flatly contradicts *Bellarmin*, who confidently affirmed, that

without all doubt, *forgiving and retaining of sins*, mentioned, *John* 20 23. was not the same thing with *binding* and *loosing*, *Matthew* 16 19.

Thirdly, *Cyprianus de Unitate Ecclesiæ*, expresly affirms, *That Christ gave alike power to all his Apostles*, Iohn 20. 23. in these words; *Accipite Spiritum Sanctum, si cujus remiseritis peccata, &c. Receive the Holy Ghost, whose soever sins ye shal forgive, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained*: and since all the Apostles (according to *Cyprianus*) had alike power given them after the Resurrection of Christ, by *John* 20. 23. without all question, he believed that the same *power of the keys*, was given to all the Apostles, which was given to *Peter*, *Matthew* 16.

The second Reason, Why those distinctions of *Polus*, *Maldonatus*, *Stapleton*, and *Bellarmin*, and others; or new devised evasions is unanswerable: *viz.* It appears by the Fathers, that no greater Ecclesiastical power imaginable, could be given to any, then that which was given to all the Apostles, in *Matthew* 18. and *John* 20. which quite destroys all those sophistical distinctions, tending all to this: That the power given to *Peter*, was greater, *Matthew* 16. 19 then that given to the other Apostles, *Matthew* 18. and *John* 20. That no greater power can be imagined, then that which was given to all the Apostles, is proved by the testimony of *Chrysostomus*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 5. *de Sacerdotio*: Where speaking of that power of the *keys* given to all the Apostles, yea, and to all Bishops, he falls to an interrogative exclamation, τίς ἂν γένοιτο τούτων ἐξουσία μείζων; That is, *I pray you, what greater power can be given then this?* But this had been a most ridiculous interrogation in *Chrysostomus*, if either he himself, or any other had believed that the *power of the keys*, promised to *Peter*, *Matthew* 16. was greater then that promised to the other Apostles, *Matthew* 18. and *John* 20. And thus much of the testimonies of those

thoſe Fathers proving directly, that the *keyes* were given to others, as well as to *Peter*.

Now followeth the teſtimonies of Fathers, proving by conſequence, that the *keyes*, *Matthew* 16. were not peculiar to *Peter*; out of which teſtimonies, three arguments are deduced. The firſt is, If *Peter* alone had the power of the *keyes* promiſed to him, *Matthew* 16. Then *Peter* would only have exerciſed the *keyes*, and no other beſide him, in ſuch a high-way as he did: But it appears by the teſtimony of *Gaudentius*, *prima de ordinationis ſua*, *that all the Apoſtles as well as Peter practiſed*, *the keys*, *viz.* in teaching, baptizing, & cenſuring. Yea, *Salmeron* the *Jeſuit*, in his Commentars upon 1. of *Peter* 1. *diſput.* 1. expreſly affirms, *That Peter ſeemed to neglect his duty in the exerciſe of the keyes*, *it ſo little appeared by his carriage and practiſe*, *that he had any Juriſdiction over the other Apoſtles.* Where obſerve the impudent ſhift of the *Jeſuit*, who being preſſed by the carriage of *Peter*, that no token of his Supremacy appeared, hath nothing to anſwer; but *that it was his own neglect*: which if it be true, was great unfaithfulneſs of *Peter*: if it be falſe, (as it is,) it is great impudence in the *Jeſuit*.

The ſecond argument taken from the Fathers, proving conſequentially that the other Apoſtles were promiſed the keyes, as well as *Peter*, is taken from *Auguſtinus*, who affirms, That *Peter* repreſented the whole Church when Chriſt promiſed him the keyes: and ſo by conſequence, in *Peter*, the other Apoſtles and all Paſtors of the Church had the keyes promiſed unto them: the words of *Auguſtinus* are thoſe following in his 124. *tractat.* upon *John*, *Quando* Petro *dictum eſt*, *tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum*, *& quodcunque ligaveris ſuper terram*, *erit ligatum & in cœlis*, *univerſam ſignificabat Eccleſiam.* And a little after, *Eccleſia*, *Ergo*, *quæ fundatur in Chriſto*, *claves ab eo regni Cœlorum accepit in Petro*, *id eſt*, *poteſtatem ligandi*, *ſolvendique*

dique peccata. In which words he expreſly affirms, *That Peter was a figure of the whole Church, when our Savior promiſed him the keyes*: and therefore in *Peter* the keyes were given to the whole Church, and not to *Peter* alone.

Our adverſaries puſled with this teſtimony of *Auguſtinus*, after their accuſtomed manner, fall to their new deviſed diſtinctions, explaining how the keyes were given to *Peter*, repreſenting the whole Church? Or how they were given to the whole Church in *Peter*? And firſt *Horantius*, *lib. 6. cap. 10. Locor. Cathol.* affirms, That the keys were given to the whole Church in *Peter*; that is ſaith he, *They were given to Peter for the good of the whole Church*, as when any is made King of any Nation, the Kingdom or Kingly Authority is given to him for the good of the whole Nation: and ſo *Peter*, as Prince of the Church, had the keyes given unto him for the good of the whole Church: and in this manner, the keyes were given to the whole Church in *Peter*. But it is anſwered, *Horantius* his Gloſs is far beſide the Text of *Auguſtinus*: who expreſly diſputs, *The keyes were not given to Peter alone, but to the whole Church*: for if they were only given to *Peter* the whole Church would not have exerciſed them: he diſputs ſo, *tractat.* 50. upon *John*, and therefore concluds, that the keyes were not given alone to *Peter*, becauſe the whole Church exerciſed them as well as *Peter*: *Auguſtinus* doth not diſput for what end the keyes were given? but to whom alſo this Gloſs of *Horantius* expreſly contradicts *Auguſtinus*. *Horantius* affirms, *That the keyes in the ſame manner were given to the whole Church in Peter, as when any is made King of a Nation, the Authority of a King is given to the whole Nation: that is*, ſaith he, *He who is made King gets that Authority for the good of the whole Nation*: which is a flat contradiction of *Auguſtinus*, for that Nation, or whole Nation cannot be ſaid to exerciſe the Kingly Authority, when he who is made King gets it: But *Auguſtinus*

ſtinus expreſly diſputs, That the whole Church exerciſed the keyes as well as *Peter*: and therefore the keyes were given to the whole Church in *Peter*: otherwiſe, ſaith he, The whole Church would not have exerciſed them, *tractat.* 50. His words are, , *If Peter had not repreſented the Church, our Lord had not ſaid unto him, I will give unto thee the keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven. For if that only was ſaid to Peter, The Church hath no power of binding or looſing, and ſince the Church hath that power, Peter was the Sacrament or Figure of the whole Church, or miſtically repreſented the whole Church, when our Savior promiſed to him the keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven*, and that is the ſum of the diſput of *Auguſtinus*, *tractat.* 50. For ſatisfaction of the Reader we will ſet down his words which are theſe, *Nam ſi in Petro non eſſet Eccleſiæ Sacramentum, non ei diceret Dominus, tibi dabo claves regni cælorum, & quæcunque ſolveris in terra, ſoluta erunt in cælo: & quæcunque ligaveris in terra, ligata erant & in cælr. Si hoc Petro tantum dictum eſt, non facit hoc Eccleſia: Si autem & in Eccleſia fit, ut quæ in terra ligantur, in cælo ligentur, & quæ ſoluuntur in terra, ſoluantur in cælo, quia cum excommunicat Eccleſia, in cælo ligatur excommunicatus: cum reconciliatur ab Eccleſia, in cælo ſolvitur excommunicatus: ſi hoc, Ergo, in Eccleſia fit. Petrus quando claves accepit, Eccleſiam ſanctam ſignificavit.* By which it appears, that he expreſly diſputs that *Peter* had not the keyes given to him alone, becauſe the whole Church uſed them as well as he: and thence concluds, that he repreſented the whole Church, when our Savior promiſed to him the keyes: and therefore it is falſe which *Horantius* affirms, *That the whole Church got the keyes in* Peter, *as Germany gets the Empire, when any is made Emperor of Germany*: Since all *Germany* doth not exerciſe the Imperial Authority as the whole Church doth that of the Keyes.

Bellarmin gloſſeth otherwiſe upon *Auguſtinus*, he affirms, Peter may be ſaid two wayes to repreſent the Church. Firſt, *hiſto-*

historically, as when any represents that which is done by another, by that which is really done by himself: and so, saith he, *Abraham* having two sons, *Isaac* and *Ishmael*, represented God, who was to have two peoples. The second way of *Bellarmins* representing, is called by him *Parabolick*, *viz.* when any thing is represented by a probable fiction, not really done: So our Savior preaching the Gospel, is signified by *a sower of good seed*. He applyeth that *Peter* signified the Church the first way: so that he *truly*, *principally*, and *immediatly* got the keyes; and in getting them, signified the whole Church: which was to get them afterwards in its own proper way.

But it is answered, It is very ordinar with *Bellarmin* to spin out subtilties nothing to the purpose to delude his readers, when he is pusled: it were prolix to retex his sophistry in this particular: we only answer, that *Peter* represented the Church in none of those wayes mentioned by *Bellarmin*, but in a third, *viz.* *As when a Society alike interessed in any priviledge, hath that priviledge given to them all, when it is given to any one of them*: in which case, every one of that Society hath the benefit of that priviledge as well, and equally with him, to whom it was given in all their names.

Bellarmin objects, That it is not the meaning of *Augustinus*, that *Peter* got the keyes in the name of the rest as their Legat, or Vicar: *Ergo*, it is his meaning, that *Peter* got them as their Moderator, or Prince: as when any thing is given to a King, it may be said to be given to the whole Kingdom, because it is given for the publick utility of all.

But it is answered, It is true which *Bellarmin* affirms, that *Peter* did not get the keyes as a *Legat*, *or Vicar gets any thing in the name of his King*: for so *Peter* had gotten nothing to himself, no more then an Ambassador representing his King, marrying a wife to his King or in his Kings Name: but it doth not follow that *Peter* got the keyes as Monarch of the Church, or

as

as the Church got them in *Peter*, as a *Kingdom gets any thing given to their King*: becauſe it is notoriouſly falſe, ſince the Church, according to *Auguſtinus*, had the power of the keyes, as well as *Peter*: but a Kingdom hath not the uſe or property of that which is given unto their King: and therefore we affirm, That *Bellarmins* enumeration is ſtill inſufficient; for *Peter* got the keyes neither as Vicar of the Church, nor a Moderator or Prince of the Church, but as one of the Society of the Paſtors and Apoſtles of the Church, as if our Savior had ſaid to *Peter*, *I give unto thee the power of the keyes, and in thee to all Paſtors, to be alike exerciſed by thee and them.*

Bellarmin inſtances that *Auguſtinus* affirms, that the Church was ſignified by *Peter*, *Propter eum quem gerebat Primatum*, that is, *Becauſe of the Primacy he had in the Church.*

But it is anſwered, That *Auguſtinus* by *Primacy* means no other thing then *Apoſtleſhip*, that is, *Auguſtinus* affirms, *Peter had a Primacy in the Church, becauſe he was an Apoſtle in the Church*: as he explains himſelf in many places, as in his laſt Treatiſe upon *John*, he affirms that *Peter ſignified the whole Church, becauſe of the Primacy of his Apoſtleſhip; propter Apoſtolatus Primatum*: he hath the like words in his 23. Sermon upon the words of Chriſt, and likewiſe upon *Pſalm* 108. and eſpecially, *lib.* 2. *of Baptiſm againſt the Donatiſts*, he hath theſe words, *Quis neſcit illum Apoſtolatus Principatum, cuilibet Epiſcopatui preferendum? Who knows not that the Primacy of an Apoſtleſhip is to be preferred to any Biſhoprick?* by which it is moſt evident, that the meaning of *Auguſtinus*, affirming, *Peter had a Supremacy in the Church*, is no other, then that he was an Apoſtle of the Church. Eſpecially ſince *Auguſtinus* diſputed, that the keyes were not given to *Peter* alone, but alſo to the whole Church.

But *Bellarmin* inſtances, it is true, *That the whole Church had the uſe of the keyes, as well as Peter, but by the gift of Peter,*

who distributed them to other Pastors, according to his pleasure: himself only having them immediatly from Christ; as when a King, having his power *immediatly from God*, communicats his Jurisdiction to inferior Magistrats, in giving them particular charges of exercising *Jurisdiction*.

But it is answered, This Glos of *Bellarmins* is against all Antiquity: innumerable testimonies of Fathers might be produced, that the other Apostles had the *keyes* given them as well as *Peter*: but *Bellarmin* cannot produce one testimony to prove that the meaning of those Fathers is, *That the keyes were immediatly given to Peter, and by his communication distributed to the rest.* Nothing such appears out of *Augustinus*, but the contrair. *Cyprianus* expresly affirms, That *all the Apostles were of alike power with Peter.* And *Franciscus de Victoria*, a great Popish Doctor, the most learned Divine that ever *Spain* produced as he is called by *Canus, loc. Theol, lib.* 12. *cap.* 1. *Relect.* 2. *quest.* 2. *conclus.* 3. *and* 4. Commenting upon that place of *Cyprian de unita. Eccles.* expresly affirms, That *all the Apostles received all the power both of Order, and Jurisdiction immediatly from Christ*: and inveighs against the ordinar Glos upon that place, for distinguishing between *Order* and *Jurisdiction*: that is for affirming, That all the Apostles had their *Orders* immediatly from Christ, but not their *Jurisdiction*, or the power of the keyes: which he affirms to be farr from the meaning of *Cyprian*.

The third argument of Fathers, proving by consequence, that the *keyes* were given to others also beside *Peter*, is, because *Peter* spoke in the name of the rest, or answered the question of our Savior for them all: *Anselmus* on *Matthew* 16. hath these words, *Notandum est, quod haec potestas, non solum Petro data est: sed sicut* Petrus, *unus pro omnibus respondit, sic in* Petro *omnibus hanc potestatem dedit: It is to be observed, that this power of the keyes was not only given to* Peter, *but as* Peter *alone answered*

anſwered for them all, ſo in Peter *he gave that power unto them all.*

Bellarmin anſwers, That *Peter* anſwered for all as their *Prince, Head,* and *Mouth,* not as one *commiſſionat* from them to anſwer in all their names: in which caſe, he would have known what they were to anſwer to our Saviors queſtion? asking them *what he was?* But *Peter* did not know what the other Apoſtles would anſwer to that queſtion of our Savior; and therefore he anſwered as their Prince and Head.

But it is replyed, We grant that *Peter* was not *commiſſionat* from the reſt to anſwer for them; but we deny it to follow, that he anſwered as their *Prince* and *Head*: there is a mids, *viz.* he anſwered *as one of their number*, as when any is riding out the way, he meets with a number of people, asks of them the right way, or ſome other queſtion: one more ready then the reſt anſwers firſt. It is notorious he had no commiſſion from the reſt to anſwer; and yet it doth not follow, that he is *Head* or *Prince* of the reſt: by which it appears, that this reaſoning of *Bellarmins* is nothing elſe but Sophiſtry: and whereas *Bellarmin* affirms, That *Peter anſwered only for himſelf*, and not for the reſt, becauſe he knew not what they would anſwer; It is frivolous, becauſe it was ſufficient, that *Peter* knew what they ought to have anſwered, if they anſwered aright: *Bellarmin* urgeth, a reward is given to *Peter* in theſe words for his anſwer; but ſince the others did not anſwer at all, but only himſelf without *commiſſion* from the reſt; It follows of neceſſity, that the reward, *viz.* the *keyes* were given to *Peter* alone, and not to the reſt; eſpecially, ſince our Savior affirms, That it was revealed by God only to *Peter*, that Chriſt was the Son of God.

But it is replyed, The words of our Savior are, *That the ſaid myſtery was revealed to* Peter *by God only*: but it doth not follow, *That it was revealed to* Peter *only*: that is uncertain,

yea, rather notoriously false: Since *Peter*, *John* 6. 69. in the name of all the rest, hath these words, *And we believe, and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God:* by which it appears, that the other disciples knew that mystery as well as *Peter*, since *Peter* expressly affirms in that place, *They all believed it.*

Bellarmin instances, how know we that *Peter* spake for the rest, and not for himself alone? since it cannot be gathered from the Text. But it is answered first, How knoweth *Bellarmin* that *Peter* answered for himself and not for the rest? Since no such thing can be gathered from the Text. It is answered, Secondly, That it is evident from the Text, that *Peter* answered for the rest: because Christ asked not the question of *Peter* alone, but of them all: he asketh *whom they thought he was:* and since *Peter* immediatly answered (being more ready then the rest, as *Chrysostom* affirms) it is evident, that *Peter* answered in the name of them all.

Franciscus Agricola, besides those reasons of *Bellarmin*, adds others to prove, that *Peter* answered for himself alone, and not for the rest: His first reason is this, Because he answered not for *Judas*, since *Judas* believed no such thing *as Christ was the Son of God*; Ergo, he answered not for them all. But it is answered, It doth not follow. He answered not for them all, Because *Judas* believed not: because, *John* 6. 69. *Agricola* will not deny that *Peter* answered for them all; and yet, the not believing of *Judas* might as well militat against his answering for them all, *John* 6. as *Matthew* 16. *Peter* answered, What they all ought to have believed: and in so doing, answered for all, albeit they did not all believe.

Another of *Agricola* his reasons not mentioned by *Bellarmin* is this, Our Savior pronounced only *Peter blessed*, and not the other Apostles: *Ergo*, *Peter* answered only for himself, and not for all: otherwise our Savior would have called them all *blessed.*

But

But it is anſwered, Our Savior called only *Peter bleſſed*, becauſe *Peter* only anſwered: and ſo in pronouncing him *bleſſed*, He called them all *bleſſed*, becauſe he anſwered in the name of them all. So, *Hilarius*, *de Vinctat.* 6. alluding to this place, ſaith *O ye holy and bleſſed men, who procured the keys o the Kingdom of Heaven, by the merit of your Faith*: In which words he applyeth that *bleſſing* of Chriſt to all alike.

Agricola hath three other Reaſons, Proving that *Peter* anſwered only for himſelf, and not for all; but they are the ſame with thoſe of *Bellarmin*, which we anſwered already: and thus much of the *keys*, *Matthew* 16. 19. which is the ſecond argument pretended by the *Romiſh* Doctors, for proving *that* Peter *was inſtituted Oecumenick Biſhop by Chriſt.*

CHAP. IX.

of Iohn 21. 15, 16, 17. *Or feed my Sheep.*

THe third argument, proving that our Savior ordained *Peter Monarch of the Church*, is taken from the words of our Savior, *John* 21. 15, 16, 17. where thrice our Savior commands him *to feed his Sheep*, viz. *to feed his Lambs, verſe* 15. *his Sheep, verſe* 16, 17.

But it is anſwered, That argument is inconiequent; for although our Savior injoyned the *feeding of his Sheep* to *Peter*, it doth not follow that he ordained him *Oecumenick Biſhop*: for three reaſons The firſt is, becauſe *feeding of Chriſts Sheep* is not to command *Chriſtians*, *nor to exerciſe dominion over them, as a Monarch*: Since the Apoſtle *Peter* himſelf, in his *firſt Epiſtle*, *cap.* 5. *verſe* 3. expreſly forbids dominion to thoſe to whom the feeding of Chriſts Flock was injoyned, *verſe* 2.

Bellarmin

Bellarmin, lib. 1. cap. 15. de Pont. Rom. endeavors to prove, that in the word *Feeding*, *supream Jurisdiction over the whole Church* is committed to *Peter* by several reasons. The first is, that it *comprehends all the duty of a Pastor*: which consists not only in *Ministring Food*, but also in *Governing* and *Chastising*: As appears by our Savior using the *Greek verb*, ποιμαίνειν, which signifies *to feed by commanding*, in which sense, Kings are called by *Homer*, λαῶν ποιμένες, *Pastors of the people.*

But it is answered, *Bellarmin* subtilty in such *Grammaticisms* hath no ground: Our Savior in the same place, useth the *Greek verb*, βόσκειν, as well as, ποιμαίνειν: both which, not only the *Syrian Interpreters*, but also the *Latin* renders the same way, *viz. to feed.* But it is notorious that the *verb* βόσκειν, imports no dominion at all; but only *Ministration of food.* Secondly, albeit there were such a Mystery in the *Greek verb*, ποιμαίνειν, as to signify *Jurisdiction*; Yet it is injoyned to *Peter*, *over the Flock only, and not over the Pastors*: which doth not conclude an *Oecumenick Bishop*, to whom *Bellarmin* gives authority of feeding the *Pastors*, as well as the *Flock.*

Bellarmins second reason, by which he proves that supream authority is given to *Peter*, by these words of our Savior, *Feed my Sheep*, is, because several Fathers, calls that which was injoyned to *Peter*, in these words, ποιμαίνειν, *Præfecturam*, or, *A having authority over the Flock of Christ*: So *Chrysostomus, lib. 2. de Sacerdotio*, and *Augustinus* on *John* 21.

But it is answered, *Chrysostom* is disputing there of the *Priesthood*, which is common to all *Priests*, and not of an *Oecumenick Bishop*: Neither can it be denyed, that any *Bishop* hath that authority over his own Flock, which is mentioned by *Chrysostom* in that place: *viz. Governing* and *Chastising*, which is also the meaning of *Augustinus*. *Bellarmin* cites an other

other teſtimony of *Gregorius*, *de cura Paſtorali*, where *Paſtors* are called by him *Rectors*; but his meaning is the ſame, as appears by the ſcope of his diſput, needleſs to be inſerted: he is enumerating theſe duties belonging to a *Paſtor*: amongſt which, he doth not mention one peculiar to an *Oecumenick Biſhop*, and which is not common to all *Paſtors*.

Bellarmin uſeth other reaſons, beſides theſe two, which in effect, are the ſame with his firſt reaſon: It is very ordinar with him, to repeat the ſame arguments in other words, to make ignorants believe that his Army is numerous.

The ſecond reaſon, wherefore our Savior in theſe words, *Feed my Sheep*, injoyns *no univerſal juriſdiction over the Church*, is, becauſe he injoyns the ſame to others beſide *Peter*: Which is proved, Firſt by Scripture: Secondly, by Fathers. The paſſages of Scripture, are *John* 20. 21. where our Savior affirmeth, *As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you*: Which words are expounded by *Cyrillus*, *lib.* 12. in *John*. by *Chryſoſtomus*, *hom.* 85. upon *John*, By *Theophylactus* upon this place to this purpoſe: *viz.* *Cyrillus* affirms, That all the Apoſtles were *ordained Doctors of the whole World, to inlighten not only the Jews, but all the Nations of the World.* *Chryſoſtomus* and *Theophylactus*, interpret theſe words, *That Chriſt injoyned his own work unto all the Apoſtles.*

The ſecond paſſage of Scripture is, *Matthew* 28. 19. *Go therefore and teach all Nations*, the *Greek verb*, μαθητευσατε, *to Teach*, imports all the authority that a Maſter hath over his Diſciples; *viz.* *To Govern them, to Chaſtiſe them*, and not only to *teach* them: And conſequently, is of as large an extent as, ποιμαινειν, *to Feed*: Of which *Bellarmin* brags ſo much: And thus much of Scripture.

In the next place, it is proved by Antiquity, that nothing peculiar was imagined to *Peter*, in theſe words, *Feed my Sheep*. The firſt teſtimony is from the third Epiſtle amongſt theſe

of

of *Cyprian*, in which the *Clergy of Rome*, speaks thus to the *Clergy of Carthage*. *Sed & Simoni sic dicit, diligis me? respondit, diligo. Ait ei, pasce oves meas. Hoc verbum factum, ex ipso actu quo cessit, agnoscimus: & cæteri Discipuli similiter.* By which words it appears, that it was the opinion of the *Clergy of Rome*, in the days of *Cyprian*, *That the feeding of the Flock of Christ*, was injoyned to others, *viz.* to all the Apostles as well as to *Peter*.

Cyprianus himself, *de Unitate Ecclesiæ*, *They are all Pastors, but the Flock is one, which all the Apostles feed with one consent*; and a little before, immediatly after he had cited these words of our Savior, *Feed my Sheep*, he subjoyns, *That Christ gave to all the Apostles alike power after his Resurrection.*

Augustinus, *tract.* 123. *upon John*, *Chrysostomus*, *de Sacerdotio*, *lib.* 2. *Basilius*, *cap.* 22. of the *Constitution of Monks*, all expresly affirm, That the *feeding of the Flock of Christ*, *was committed to all Pastors and Bishops*, *by our Savior in these words.* It is needless to set down the words of these Fathers, since these testimonies are granted by our Adversaries; who notwithstanding of them, endeavor so to prove, that these words of our Savior, were in a peculiar manner directed to *Peter*. So *Bellarmin* and *Sanderus*, they reason thus.

First, *Bellarmin* takes much pains to prove, that our Savior directed his speech only to *Peter*, which none denys: *Quid tum postea?* He instances, that the rest are excluded by these words of our Savior, *Lovest thou me more then these? By the three-fold reiteration of that question*; by these words of our Savior, *when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands* and by these words of *Peter*, verse 21. *Lord, what shal this man do?* And of the answer of Christ, *What is that to thee? Follow thou me.* But, say they, *Peter* would never have asked *what*

what John ſhould do? If Chriſt had ſaid to *John*, *Feed my Sheep*, neither would the Lord have anſwered, *What is that to thee? Follow thou me:* but he would have anſwered, *He ſhal feed my ſheep, as thou ſhalt.*

But it is anſwered, All this reaſoning is nothing elſe, but a rible rable of ſophiſtry; Firſt, *Bellarmin* ſophiſticats in ſtateing of the queſtion: as if *Proteſtants* denyed, that theſe words of our Savior were directed to *Peter* alone: And therefore he proves, by all thoſe circumſtances foreſaid, that our Savior *ſpoke only to Peter*, which none denys. The thing which is denyed, is, the conſequence, or it doth not follow, *That the feeding of the Flock of Chriſt, was only committed to* Peter, *becauſe the words of our Savior were only directed to him*: no more then it followeth, *That* Adam *and* Eve *ſhould only increaſe and multiply, becauſe God directed his ſpeech to them only.*

Secondly, *Bellarmin* doth not conſider, for what reaſon our Savior directed his ſpeech to *Peter* only, in theſe words, *Feed my Sheep?* It was not, becauſe it was his intention to give to *Peter Juriſdiction over the whole Church*: but for other two reaſons. The Firſt is, becauſe *Peter had thrice denyed him*: ſo *Cyrillus* in *John*, *lib.* 12. *cap.* 64. who affirms ſo much. And likewiſe *Iſidorus Peluſiota*, *lib.* 1. *epiſt.* 103. and alſo, *epiſt.* 356. and *Nazianzenus*, *in his Oration in Sancta Lumina*, hath theſe words, *Chriſt admitted* Peter *an Apoſtle again, and healed his threefold denying of him, by a threefold interrogation, to which* Peter *made a threefold confeſſion*: by which words, an other reaſon appears, wherefore our Savior directed his ſpeech to *Peter* alone? *viz.* To reſtore him to his *Apoſtleſhip*, which he had loſt, by denying Chriſt. *Cyrillus* in the foreſaid place affirms, *Although all the Diſciples were ſore afraid, and ran away, when Chriſt was apprehended, yet the crime of* Peter *was greateſt, becauſe he denyed him thrice in ſo ſhort a*

time: where he affirms also, that the *Apostleship was restored unto him*, by these words of our Savior, *Feed my Sheep*. After his answering the three-fold interrogation of Christ, he had professed thrice, *He loved Christ*: by testimonies of which Fathers, it appears, that nothing *peculiar to Peter* was given in these words, *Feed my Sheep*. Since the *Apostleship* is common to *Peter*, with the other Apostles. And therefore, *Peter* was not ordained *Oecumenick Bishop* in these words.

The third Sophistry of *Bellarmin*, consists in his reasoning thus, If *Peter*, saith he, had believed that these words of Christ had belonged to *John*, as well as to himself; or if our Savior had injoyned to *John*, *the feeding of his Sheep*, as well as unto *Peter*, *Peter* would never have demanded of our Savior, *What John should do?* Neither would our Savior have answered him, *What is that to thee? Follow thou me*: For *Peter* would have known what *John* should do; *viz. Feed Christs Sheep*, and our Savior would have answered him, *John shal feed my Sheep as thou dost*.

But it is answered, This disputation of *Bellarmins* is most shameless babling for that question of *Peter*, *Asking what John should do?* And that answer of Christ, *What is that to thee?* are not relative to these words of Christ, *Feed my Sheep*: but to these, verse 18. *When thou shalt be old thou shalt stretch forth thine hands*: shewing to *Peter* what death he should die? Whereupon *Peter* asketh Christ, *What John should do? or what should become of him? or what death he should die?* To which our Savior answers, *What is that to thee?* That this is the true gloss, appears by the text it self, by the Fathers, *Cyrillus*, *Euthymius*, by the *ordinar gloss*, by all the *Ancient Popish Doctors* upon the place, As *Aquinas*, *Carthusianus*, *Gorranus*, *Cajetanus*, *Toletus*, by late *Popish Doctors*, as *Maldonatus*, *Barradas*, and *Emmanuel Sa*: So that *Bellarmins* gloss is nothing els but one of his new devised fictions, by which

which he and others of late endeavor to uphold the *supremacy* of the Bishop of *Rome*, contrair to common sense, Scripture, and the whole current of *Popish Doctors* themselves, who lived before these last times.

Fourthly, *Bellarmin* comes on with an other of his glosses, of like nature: *viz.* seeing that it could not be denyed, that other Apostles and Pastors beside *Peter*, were injoyned to *feed the Flock of Christ*; since it was so clearly asserted by Scripture, and Fathers; He invents a new distinction, that they did it by the *permission of Peter*, or to use his own words, *Quia vocantur à* Petro *in partem solicitudinis*: that is, because they had a calling from *Peter* so to do, or, *Were admitted by him to a part of the care.*

But it is answered, This distinction of *Bellarmins* hath not the least ground. It is against *Scripture*, *John* 20. 21. and *Matthew* 28. 19. as both passages are expounded by the Fathers: It is contrair to Fathers, as was proved by the testimonies of the *Clergy of Rome*, of *Cyprianus*, of *Augustinus*, *Chrysostomus* and *Basilius*. Finally, it is contrair to *Popish Doctors*, as *Franciscus de Victoria*, who (as we shewed before) disputed expressly, *That all the Apostles had not only their Order, but also their Jurisdiction immediatly from Christ*: And reprehended the *ordinar gloss*, for using that distinction, in exposition of that place of *Cyprian*, *de Unitate Ecclesiæ*. *All the Apostles after the Resurrection had alike authority and power from Christ*. Neither can *Bellarmin* produce one testimony of Antiquity to maintain his gloss, *viz.* *That* Peter *immediatly had the power of feeding the Flock of Christ from Christ himself, and the other Apostles and Pastors had it only from* Peter.

Sanderus, *lib.* 6. *cap.* 4. of his *Monarchy*, useth another argument, from those words of our Savior, *Peter lovest thou me more then these?* From which words he concluds, *That the*

Feeding of the flock of Christ, was injoyned immediatly only to *Peter*; because, saith he, *Peter* loved Christ better then the other Apostles did: and therefore, *the feeding of the flock of Christ* was committed to him alone, as the reward of his love.

But it is answered, First, it cannot be gathered from the text, that *Peter* loved Christ better then the other Apostles did? *since Christ only asked him, whither he loved him better then the other Apostles did?* & *Peter* answered, *thou knowest that I love thee:* but he adds, not *better then the other Apostles do.* 2. Tho it were granted (as some of the Fathers maintain) that *Peter* loved Christ better then the other Apostles did, it is inconsequent for that reason to conclude, that *Peter* had *Jurisdiction* over the rest: for the same argument would conclude, that the Apostle *John* had *Jurisdiction* over those Apostles, who loved not Christ so well as himself: that *Stephanus* a *Deacon* had *Jurisdiction* over *Nicolaus*, an other *Deacon*: that *Peter* himself had more ample *Jurisdiction* then *Sylvester second*, *Alexander sixth*, and other Monsters, which were Bishops of *Rome*: which *Bellarmin* will not grant readily, since all Bishops of *Rome*, are in his opinion, of alike authority with *Peter*.

Lastly, *Turrianus*, *lib. 2. cap. 12 in his defence against Zadeel*, reasons thus; Let it be granted (saith he) *that all the Apostles, and all Pastors had their authority of feeding the Flock of Christ: it doth not hinder a distinction of Order among them, not though that authority be equal, as they are Pastors: yet it doth hinder one to be a Presbyter, an other to be a Bishop above him, another to be universal Bishop above all: as all men, qua homines, or as men* are equals, yet some of them are Kings, others *subjects*.

But it is answered, It far less follows, that there are several degrees of Church Orders, because they are of alike authority, or that because these words, *Feed my sheep*, were injoyned with alike authority to *Linus* and *Cletus* Bishops of *Rome*: therefore the one of them was Oecumenick Bishop, the other

not

not. The truth is, to answer in earnest to *Turrianus*, its false which he affirms, *That the equality of Authority can consist Jure Divino with Subordination of one Bishop to another.* All Bishops are *Jure Divino of alike Authority.* Subordination, or distinction of degrees in Bishops are *Jure humano*, as shal be proved in the following Books.

We have vindicated two reasons, why these words of our Savior, *Feed my sheep*, conclude not that *Peter* was ordained Oecumenick Bishop. The first was, *That feeding of the sheep of Christ, inferrs no dominion over them.* The second was, because our Savior injoyned the *Feeding of his sheep* to others, as well as to *Peter*: which we proved by Scripture, and Fathers, and answered all what our Adversaries objected to the contrair: Now followeth a third Reason, wherefore those words of our Savior to *Peter*, *Feed my sheep*, doth not conclude him Oecumenick Bishop; and is this: because many were *Christs sheep* whom *Peter* did not feed, as the *Indians*, *Ethiopians*, and *Gentiles* committed to the Apostleship of *Paul*: yea, the very Apostles themselves were the sheep of Christ, and yet we do not read in Scripture, or in writings of the Ancients, that ever *Peter* did instruct, correct, or send any of the other Apostles, or that he had any way dominion over them.

Bellarmin steps in, endeavoring to prove, that *Peter* was injoyned by these words, *Feed my sheep*, to feed the other Apostles also: he endeavors to prove it two wayes. First, reasoning from words: next, by arguments. He reasons from words two wayes. First, by a distinction of *sheep* from *lambs*; he reasons thus our Savior saith to *Peter* twice, *Feed my lambs*, and once, *Feed my sheep*: But, saith he, By twice naming of *lambs*, he means two peoples, *Jewes* and *Gentiles*: by *sheep*, he means *Pastors*, or *the Apostles themselves*. And so according to this witty Gloss, *Peter* is commanded to feed the Apostles

postles also. But if ye object to him, That the *Greek* Text marrs all his subtilty, because it hath twice, *Feed my sheep*, and but once, *Feed my lambs*: He cuts that knot, by telling you that the *Greek* Text is corrupt: which is as much as to say, That the *Greek copies*, approved by the Ancients, (as shal be proved, *lib. 6.* is corrupt, and that the *Latin version* (in which there is not so much as one found line) is *pure*, and that to maintain a *fantastick*, *ridiculous*, *groundless Gloss* of a *Jesuit*, against Scripture, against Antiquity, and an object of laughter, to the most Learned of the Roman Church themselves.

And first, It is against Scripture, who in that sort of speech takes evermore *sheep* and *lambs* indifferently for the same thing, *Matthew* 10. 16. It is said, *Behold, I send you as sheep in the midst of wolves*, *Luke, cap.* 10. *verse* 3. speaking of the same *Mission*, saith, *Go your wayes: Behold, I send you forth as lambs amongst wolves.* The *Syrian* Interpreter in both these places, calls the Apostles *Lambs amongst Wolves*; yea, our Savior, *Acts* 8. 32. is compared both to a *sheep* and a *lamb*, from *Isai.* 53. 7. as to one thing: *He was led like a sheep to the slaughter, or like a lamb dumb before his shearer*: What thinks *Bellarmin* of his subtile distinction now? Secondly, all Antiquity upon the said passage of *John* 21. 15, 16, 17. interprets *lambs* and *sheep* to be one thing. So *Augustinus*, *tractat.* 123. upon *John*; *Cyrillus* upon *John*, *lib.* 12. *cap.* 64. *Chrysostomus* on *John*, *Homily* 87. *Ambrosius*, or the Author of those sermons attributed to him, Sermon 46. It is needless to mention other Fathers.

Thirdly, *Bellarmin* exposes himself to the laughter of his own fellow *Jesuits*, as appears by two testimonies. The first is of *Maldonat the Jesuit*, upon *John* 21. Where he hath those words, *Agnos esse eos, qui in grege, id est, in Ecclesia Christi essent, dubium non est, nec subtiliter disputandum, cur agnos potius*

potius, quàm oves appellaverit? quod qui fecerit, videat etiam atque etiam, ne doctis hominibus riſum præbeat; where he expreſly affirms, *Thoſe who make ſuch diſtinctions, as* Bellarmin, *between lambs and ſheep, expoſeth themſelves to the laughter of learned men.*

The ſecond teſtimony is of *Janſenius in his Concordance*, It is needleſs to ſet down his teſtimony, the ſubſtance of it is, That there is no myſtery at all that Chriſt now ſaith, *Feed my ſheep*, then *feed my lambs*. The Evangeliſt only changeth the terms, or words, ſignifying the ſame thing, *Elegantiæ cauſâ, for elegancy, or ornatneſs.*

Bellarmins ſecond reaſon from words, is from thoſe words of our Savior, *My ſheep, my lambs.* All the Apoſtles, ſaith *Bellarmin*, are *the ſheep of Chriſt*: *Ergo, Peter* is commanded to feed them all by thoſe words, *Feed my ſheep*; ſince none are excepted, and therefore the indefinit Precept, *Feed my ſheep*, is equivalent to this univerſal Precept, *Feed all my ſheep*. Which *Turrianus* confirms not only by the Pronoun μου, but alſo by the *Greek* article τα or τα προβατα μου, which article and Pronoun evermore maketh an indefinit univerſal.

But it is anſwered, This argument of *Bellarmins* is of like ſolidity with the former. Firſt, it is againſt Scripture, to call an *indefinit propoſition univerſal*, as Acts 2. 17. *And your ſons and your daughters ſhal propheſy, and your young men ſhal ſee viſions, and your old men ſhal dream dreams*: This one inſtance overthrows the ſophiſtry of *Bellarmin* and *Turrianus*. Theſe propoſitions are *indefinit*: if *univerſal*, they were notoriouſly falſe; and yet they have both the Articles οι and αι, and the pronoun υμων.

Secondly, Albeit all the *Apoſtles be the Sheep of Chriſt*, yet ſome of Chriſts Sheep are only fed by himſelf immediately, ſuch as the Apoſtles: others are fed by thoſe whom Chriſt appoints, and thoſe are only the Sheep our Savior means in theſe

theſe words, *Feed my Sheep*: *viz.* all others beſides the Apoſtles, which are alike fed by all the Apoſtles.

In the next place, *Bellarmin* from his ſophiſtry in words, falls to his ſophiſtry in arguments. His firſt argument is this, Theſe words, *Feed my Sheep*, are all one, as if our Savior had ſaid, *Rule my Sheep-fold*, or *Flock*: but the Sheep-fold of Chriſt is only one, in which the Apoſtles are alſo comprehended; *Ergo*, our Savior in theſe words, injoyns *Peter* to feed the Apoſtles alſo.

The ſophiſtry of this reaſon appears by the parallel of theſe words, *Matthew* 28. 19. *Go ye teaching all Nations*, which queſtionleſs is to teach the Sheep-fold of Chriſt which is but one. And ſince *Bellarmin* will not deny, that *Peter* is one of that *Sheep-fold*: *Ergo*, according to *Bellarmins* Logick, all the Apoſtles are injoyned in theſe words, *to teach Peter*, or to *feed Peter*: which *Bellarmin* will not deny to be a great paradox.

The ſophiſtry of this ſort of reaſoning, is all one with that, making *paſce Oves meas*, an univerſal Precept; which is only, indefinit. There is a great difference alſo between *unum Ovile*, and *univerſum Ovile*: *Unum Ovile* is recommended to every Biſhop, but not *univerſum Ovile*: In a word, as we ſaid before, theſe *Sheep* and *Lambs*, are meant others beſides the Apoſtles, and not the Apoſtles themſelves.

Bellarmins ſecond ſophiſtry is this, Our Savior in theſe words, *commends unto* Peter, *either all his Sheep, or none of them, or ſome certain indefinit Sheep, or indefinitly Sheep*: *Its falſe, that no Sheep are commended to* Peter, *or that ſome certain Sheep are commended to* Peter, *or indefinit Sheep are commended to* Peter: Ergo, *All the Sheep are commended to* Peter, *and conſequently the Apoſtles themſelves.*

But it is anſwered, Firſt, we retort the ſophiſtry, *Matthew* 28. 19. our Savior *injoyns all the Apoſtles to teach, either*

either ſome certain perſon, or no perſons, or indefinit perſons, or all perſons. But the firſt three are abſurd, (if *Bellarmins* Logick hold) *Ergo*, they are commanded to teach all perſons, and conſequently *Peter* himſelf: which *Bellarmin* will not deny to be a great Paradox.

Secondly, ommitting theſe foolries, we affirm, That our Savior in thoſe words injoynes *Peter*, and all the Apoſtles, *to teach that doctrine which he had revealed unto themſelves immedialty*: that is, as he had fed them, ſo they ſhould feed others beſide themſelves.

Boſius de ſignis comes in with a *notable ſophiſm* which is this, our Savior (ſaith he) ſaith not to *Peter*, *Feed my ſheep hereafter*, but in the preſent tenſe, *Feed now my ſheep*: But when our Savior ſpake theſe words, he had no other ſheep but the Apoſtles: *Ergo*, ſaith he, our Savior commands *Peter* to feed the Apoſtles.

But it is anſwered, we retort the argument juſt as we did before, our Savior, *Matthew* 28. 19. affirmeth, *Teach ye all Nations* in *the preſent tenſe*, but *there were no other Chriſtians to be taught then, but the Apoſtles* (if *Boſius* ſubſume right.) Ergo, *the Apoſtles there, are commanded to teach* Peter, *which he will not eaſily grant*.

It is anſwered, Secondly, there is no difficulty in the words at all, the meaning of our Savior is no other, then that *Peter* being by theſe words ordained an Apoſtle, or reſtored to his Apoſtleſhip (according to ſome Fathers) is injoyned to put his function in practice, with the firſt occaſion: in the ſame ſenſe, that the other Apoſtles, *Matthew* 28. 19. are injoyned, to go and teach all nations, who were ſubjected to them, by right of their Apoſtleſhip: But in this place, *John* 21. to affirm, that the other Apoſtles were ſubjected to *Peter*, by reaſon of his Apoſtleſhip, is *petitio principii*, which we affirm to be notoriouſly falſe.

CHAP. X.

Of the Sophistry of Gregorius De Valentia, *and the Candid Confession of Cardinal* Cusanus.

WE have prolixly disputed those three passages of Scripture pretended by our Adversaries, to prove that the Apostle *Peter*, was ordained Monarch of the Church by Christ: we will conclude the dispute with two passages, the one of *Gregorius De Valentia*, that famous *Jesuit*: the other of *Cusanus*, that no less famous Cardinal. The ingenuity of the last will be the more perspicuous by the impudent Sophistry of the first, which is this.

If our Savior, saith he, had said to *Peter*, *I will not build the Church upon thee, as upon a Rock: or thou art not the Rock upon which I will build my Church: or I will not give unto thee the keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven: what thou binds on earth shal not be bound in Heaven: and what thou looseſt on earth, shal not be looſed in Heaven? Feed thou not my sheep:* without all question, the *Hereticks* would conclude, that our Savior did not ordain the *Apostle* Peter, *Head and Monarch of the Church:* and therefore since our Savior said unto *Peter*, *Thou art the Rock, upon which I will build my Church: I will give unto thee the keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven: what thou binds on earth shal be bound in Heaven: and what thou looseſt on earth shal be looſed in Heaven. And since our Savior injoyned him to feed his sheep:* therefore saith he, It cannot be denyed, that our Savior in these three passages, ordained the Apostle *Peter* Monarch of the Church: Because, if the negation of those things conclude, that *Peter* was not ordained Head of the Church by Christ, the affirmation of them concluds he was: having thus reasoned, he falls to the commendation of his own *acumen*: and

and of his invincible Argument: affirming, (not without laughter and aſtoniſhment of thoſe who read him) *Hic niſi vel conſcientia reclamante, vel præcipitante inſcitia, & incogitantia, nihil ab adverſariis reſponderi poſſe, certiſſimus ſane ſum.* That is *I am certainly perſwaded,* ſaith he, *That nothing can be anſwered to this argument by our adverſaries, except they be blinded either with ignorance, or fight againſt the light of their own conſcience.*

When I read this argument of *Valentia*, as it is related by *Chameir, tom. 2. lib. 11. cap. 19. num. 11.* I believed that *Chameir* had miſtaken him, or elſe that there was *vitium Typographi, or a fault of the Printer*: but when I conſulted *Valentia* himſelf in his *Analyſis, lib. 7. cap. 7.* and his *Commentarys* upon *Thomas.* I found to my aſtoniſhment, that he ſo played the fool, and then bragged of his madneſs. This argument of his is a moſt ridiculous Sophiſm: and I cannot but admire that any learned man (ſuch as *Valentia*) was not aſhamed to make uſe of ſuch an Argument, much more to brag of it as invincible.

The ground of his argument conſiſt in a *Topick Axiom* of his own diviſing againſt all the rules of *Logick*: *viz. If the negation of a certain particular conclude any thing not to be: then the affirmation of the ſaid particular concluds the ſaid thing to be,* as one would reaſon thus, if the Apoſtle *Peter* was not a Paſtor of the Church, he was not Oecumenick Biſhop, *Ergo*, if he was a Paſtor of the Church, he was Oecumenick Biſhop: which argument would prove any Paſtor of the Church, or all Paſtors of the Church to be Oecumenick Biſhops. So this *axiom* of *Valentia* is the foundation of a Syllogiſm conſiſting of affirmatives in the ſecond figure: as one would reaſon thus.

An Oecumenick Biſhop is a Doctor, or Paſtor of the Church,
Peter and Paul were Doctors and Paſtors of the Church;
Ergo, *Peter and Paul were Oecumenick Biſhops.*

Who sees not this reasoning to be childish sophistry? how can any learned man brag, that such an argument as this is invincible? It is notorious, if we endeavor to reason according to that *Axiom* of *Valentia*: We must either reason thus, in the second figure, where all the Propositions are true, but the argument *consequent*, because consisting of *Affirmatives*, or else if we reason in the first figure, the Proposition or Major is notoriously false, *viz.*

All Pastors of the Church are Oecumenick Bishops,
Peter and Paul are Pastors of the Church;
Ergo, *They are Oecumenick Bishops.*

So it appears, that the *Axiom* of *Valentia* is false; *viz. when any thing is disproved by the negation of a particular: It is proved by the affirmation of it.* For although it follow,

Simon Magus *was no Pastor of the Church,*
Ergo, he *was not Oecumenick Bishop.*

Yet it doth not follow,

Gregorius de Valentia was a Doctor or Pastor of the Church,
Ergo, *he was Oecumenick Bishop.*

And thus we have retexed that invincible argument of *Gregorius de Valentia, viz. If* Peter *did not feed the flock of* Christ, *and had not the keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven, it follows necessarily that he was not Oecumenick Bishop?* Ergo, *if he did feed the sheep of Christ, and had the keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven*; It follows, that he was *Oecumenick* Bishop. Which argument concluds alike with this.

If *Bucephalus* be not a man, he cannot be a *Jesuite*; *Ergo*, if *Luther* be a man, he must be a *Jesuite*: and thus much of *Valentia*..

We have seen how our Adversaries dispute, those three Foundations of the *Monarchy of Peter*, and consequently, of the *supremacy* of the Bishop of *Rome*, upon which the truth or falshood of the *Roman faith* depends: since without it, the faith

faith of the Church of *Rome* (as *Bellarmin* himſelf confeſſeth in the preface of his books, *de Pont. Rom.*) *Is a Body without a head, a houſe without a foundation, Moon-ſhine without the Sun.* Which is as much to ſay, as the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, having no ground in Scripture and Antiquity, the faith of the *Modern Roman Church is no faith at all.* What ground the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, or of *Peter*, hath in theſe three fore-mentioned paſſages of Scripture, from *Matthew* 16. 28. *Matthew* 16. 19. *John* 21. 15, 16, 17. in the opinion of the Ancients? We have prolixly ſhewed, by which appears, what little ſhelter our Adverſaries have in Antiquity? of which they brag ſo much. They brag alſo of Unity, or concord among themſelves, and therefore it will not be unpleaſing to ſet down the opinion of *Cardinal Cuſanus* (as great an *Antiquary*, as learned a man, of as much *Intergrity* as any, whom ever the Church of *Rome* produced) concerning theſe three foreſaid paſſages of Scripture; upon which the *Roman faith* is founded: His words, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 13. *concord, Cathol.* Are theſe following, *Nihil enim dictum eſt ad* Petrum, *quod etiam alijs dictum non ſit: nonne ſicut* Petro *dictum eſt, quodcunque ligaveris, ita alijs eſt dictum, quemcunque ligaveritis? Et quanquam* Petro *dictum eſt,* Tu es Petrus. *Si* Petrus *per* Petram *lapis fundamenti Eccleſiæ intelligi deberet, tunc ſecundùm, S.* Hieronymum *ita ſimiliter alij Apoſtoli fuerunt lapides,* Apoc. 21: *Et ſicut dictum eſt* Petro, *Paſce Oves, tamen iſta Paſtura eſt in verbo & exemplo, quæ præcipitur alijs Apoſtolis, ite in mundum univerſum, &c.*

It is Engliſhed, thus, *Nothing was ſaid to* Peter, *which was not ſaid to the other Apoſtles: as it was ſaid unto Peter, What ever thou ſhalt binde, &c. Was it not alſo ſaid to the reſt, Whom ſoever ye ſhal binde, &c? And although it was ſaid unto* Peter, Thou art Peter, *if* Peter *be ſignified by the* Rock, *as a ſtone of the foundation*

foundation of the Church: then according to Hieronymus, *the other Apostles were also foundation stones*, Apoc. 21. *And as it was said to* Peter, Feed my Sheep, *nevertheless, that feeding consists in teaching, and example, which is injoyned to the other Apostles also, in these words, Go ye teaching all Nations.* And thus much *Cusanus*, in which words although a *Cardinal*, yet he shews himself a *Protestant*, in the exposition of these places, which are the chief *basis* of the *Modern Roman faith*: and he proves his exposition by Scripture, and Antiquity: Which is as much to say, that in his opinion to wrest these three passages, to prove the *institution of Peter Monarch of the Church*, is against both Scripture, and Antiquity: Yea, in an other place, *viz. dist. in novo* 24. *quest.* 1. he expresly affirms, *That it is most certain that* Peter *got no more power from Christ, then the other Apostles*; his words are, *Sed scimus quod Petrus nihil plus potestatis à Christo accepit alijs Apostolis*: and because they distinguish *Equality of Order*, from *Equality of Jurisdiction*; that is, all the Apostles had equal power of *Order*, but not of *Jurisdiction*. And whereas, Secondly, they distinguish *mediate power* from *immediate power*, behold their Unity, yet in both these distinctions: *Franciscus de Victoria* (according to *Canus*, *loc. theol. lib.* 12. *cap.* 1. the learnedst Divine of *Spain*) *Relect.* 2. *quest.* 1. *conclus.* 3. *&* 4. hath these words, *Potestatem Apostoli receperunt immediatè à Christo, quod pro certo mihi videtur pronunciandum. Hæc est apertè sententia* Cypriani, *epist. de unitate Ecclesiæ: hoc erant cæteri Apostoli quod* Petrus, *nec audienda est glossa, dicens, Hoc non intelligi de potestatis plenitudine, ut patet apud* Cyprianum. *Quod pro certo mihi videtur pronunciandum*: In which words, he not only affirmeth, *That all the Apostles had their power immediately from Christ: but also, alike power immediatly from Christ*: reprehending that ordinar distinction of the *Roman Church*, *viz.* That

That all the Apoſtles although they had their power immediately from Chriſt, yet not *ſecundum plenitudinem poteſtatis*, which he proves by that paſſage of *Cyprian, de unitate Eccleſiæ*, affirming, *What ever Peter was, the other Apoſtles were the ſame, of alike power and dignity with him.* And thus much of theſe three famous paſſages of Scripture, *Matthew* 16. 18. and 19. and *John* 21. *v.*15, 16,17. all the grounds which theſe of the Church of *Rome* have, to prove that the bleſſed Apoſtle *Peter*, was ordained by our Savior, *viſible Monarch of the Church, or Head of the Church under himſelf.*

CHAP. XI.

Of firſt Peter, *Fifth verſe Vindicated.*

ALthough *Proteſtants* be not oblieged by law of Diſputation, to prove a *negative*: or that *Peter* was not ordained *Oecumenick Biſhop* by Chriſt (it being enough for them, to refute theſe arguments of our Adverſaries, endeavoring to prove he was) yet ſince the *Spirit of God*, (fore-ſeeing that the ſupremacy of *Peter* would be the pretended foundation of that Kingdom of *Anti-Chriſt*) hath recorded ſeveral paſſages in Scripture, expreſly inhibiting, and militating againſt that function of *Viſible Head*, and *Oecumenick Biſhop*. Therefore theſe paſſages ought not to be neglected (ſince they are recorded in Scripture for our inſtruction) but on the contrair, diligently examined, and vindicated, from the perplexed ſophiſtry of our Adverſaries. Their offenſive ſophiſtry, in thoſe three places which we have already diſputed, was very great: their defenſive in theſe three following is no leſs: But in a fourth place claimed by both ſides moſt admirable.

Our Adverſaries pretended three arguments, to prove the

inſti-

institution of Peters Monarchy of the Church. First, *Because the Church was built upon him.* Secondly, *Because the keys of Heaven were promised to him.* Thirdly, *Because our Savior directed these words to him, Feed my Sheep.* The *Protestants* disput against the supremacy of *Peters* institution by Christ, by three arguments also. The first is, because all *Domination is forbidden in Church-Officers.* The second is, because *there is no Head in the Church but only Christ.* The third is because the *Apostles puts more persons then one in the first or higheſt place of the Hierarchy of the Church.*

The first argument, then, is this, *All dominion is forbidden in the Church, but the institution of* Peters *Monarchy of the Church, or an Oecumenick Bishop, inferrs domination:* Ergo, *the office of an Oecumenick Bishop is forbidden in the Church.* The *Minor* is proved by 1. *Peter* 5. 2. and 3. *Feed the Flock of God, which dependeth upon you, caring for it not by constraint; but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind: not as though ye were Lords over Gods heritage, but that ye may be ensamples to the Flock.*

Sanderus, lib. 6. cap. 1. Of his Monarchy, seems to deny the *Major*, *viz. That an Oecumenick Bishop inferrs domination:* Affirming it inferrs only *Primacy*, but he is abandoned by all the Doctors of the Church of *Rome*; since it cannot be denyed, that the Bishop of *Rome* hath domination (and as shal immediately be proved) *Tyranick domination.* And therefore, all the Doctors of the Church of *Rome* distinguish, *viz.* that *Tyranick domination* is only forbidden, 1. *Peter* 5. they deny that the domination of an Oecumenick Bishop is Tyranical.

But it is replyed, First, that all *domination is forbidden, and not only Tyranical domination.* Secondly, *the domination of an Oecumenick Bishop, is tyranical, as it is now exercised by the Bishop of* Rome.

Haius our Countrey-man, *disput. lib.* 1. answers that *Peter*

Peter 1. 5. forbidds only, *tyrannical domination*, which he proves by the *Greek verb*, κατακυριεύειν, uſed by the Apoſtle in the ſaid place, which evermore imports *tyrannical domination*, as the *verb*, κυριεύειν, ſignifies to *exerciſe dominion lawfully*.

But he is miſtaken: Both theſe *verbs* are uſed promiſcuouſly in Scripture for the ſame: both ſignifying *lawful dominion*, or *exerciſing dominion lawfully*, as appears by comparing, *Matthew* 20. 25. and *Mark* 10. 42. where the *verb*, κατακυριεύειν is uſed, ſpeaking how the Kings of the *Gentiles* exerciſe dominion over their Subjects? But, *Luke* 22. 25. ſpeaking of the ſame *Lording*, he uſeth the other *Greek verb*, κυριεύειν; Whereby it appears that theſe two *Greek verbs* ſignify both one ſort of ruling which is lawful: and not the one of them uſed by *Peter*, 1. 5. ſignifyeth *tyrannical domination*: Since none will deny, that the ruling, or domination of the Kings of the *Gentiles*, may be lawful domination. Which is further confirmed, becauſe the *Septuaginta*, ſpeaking of *lawful domination*, in many places uſeth the ſame *Greek verb*, κατακυριεύειν, made uſe of by *Peter*, 1. 5. 3. as *Pſalm* 72. 8. and 110. 2. and *Geneſis* 1. 28. other innumerable places might be added, but theſe are ſufficient.

It is anſwered, Secondly, Although it were granted, that *tyrannical domination were only forbidden, Peter* 1. 5. yet it quite overthrowes an *Oecumenick Biſhop*, Or the domination now exerciſed by the Biſhop of *Rome*, then which no greater tyranny can be imagined, ſince he takes upon himſelf, ſupream dominion: 1. *In Spirituals*. 2. *In Temporals*. 3. *Over Souls departed*. 4. *Over Angels*. 5. He takes upon him titles proper to *God himſelf*. 6. Hears *blaſphemous compariſons* of himſelf with Chriſt, made to himſelf by others: not only not puniſhing theſe blaſpheming *Paraſyts*, but alſo hearing them patiently, and rewarding them. Theſe ſix particulars ſeem

incredible, notwithstanding that they are the doctrine of the *Modern Church of Rome*, and particular Church of *Rome* (the infallibility of which *Bellarmin* with great animosity endeavors to demonstrate, *lib.* 4. *de Pont. Rom. cap.* 4.) appears by what followeth, tracing these six particulars in order.

And first, He assumes to himself *Infallibility in Cathedra*; that is, *Teaching the whole Church he cannot err*: which is most *abominable tyranny*: since under the pain of Heresie we are bound to believe a *Pope*, if he shal teach Heresie. They strive to elude this, *Because a Pope cannot teach Heresie* to the whole Church. Which assertion of theirs is false, as appears by these following reasons. First, It is granted by them all, that *Popes* may be most wicked men; yea, and *Magicians*. But it is madness to affirm, that men living in paction with the Devil, cannot err, teaching the whole Church. Secondly, It is evident by History, and confessed by *Barronius* himself, *Anno* 538. *num.* 20. and *Liberatus*, *breviar. cap.* 22. that *Vigilius Bishop of* Rome, *obtained that Bishoprick from the Empress* Theodora: *and from* Belisarius *General to* Justinianus *the Emperor*, *by promising to the Empress to cass and abrogat the Council of* Chalcedon, *to establish by authority the Eutychian Heresie, and by promising gold to the said* Belisarius: *and likewise that he wrote several Epistles to several persons, confirming them in the Eutychian Heresie.* But it is impudence to deny, that any entring to the *Bishoprick* of *Rome*, by such means, can be infallible in teaching the Church. Thirdly, They who affirm and teach that a *Bishop of* Rome *is infallible in Cathedra*, fights against reason, common sense, and the light of all History; by which it appears, that several *Popes* have not only been condemned by other *Popes*, and *general Councils*, for *Hereticks*, but also for *teaching Heresie*: Of which we shal give many instances, *part* 3. *lib.* 2. tedious to be inserted here; we will only mention *Honorius* Bishop of *Rome*, who

who was condemned as an Heretick by the ſixth General Council, *act.* 12. & 13. by the ſeventh General Council in the laſt Act. by the eight General Council, *act.* 7. And likewiſe it appears by the records of the ſaid Councils, that the ſaid *Honorius* was declared an Heretick, by three Biſhops of *Rome*, *Agatho*, *Leo ſecond*, and *Adrianus ſecond*: and leſt they think to eſcape this difficulty by diſtinguiſhing (as they uſe to do in ſuch caſes) that *Honorius taught Hereſie as a private perſon*, and not *in Cathedra*: It is evident by the 12. and 13. Act of the ſixth Council, that the ſaid Council condemned two decretal Epiſtles of the ſaid *Honorius*, as Heretical. But none will deny that *Popes* in their decretals, *teach the whole Church*. *Alphonſus, de caſtro, lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. *page* 20. concluds, *Celeſtinus Biſhop of Rome taught Hereſie, becauſe he had read Heretical Doctrine, in an old decretal Epiſtle of his*; Likewiſe of late, *Pope John* 23. was declared an Heretick by the Council of *Conſtance*, and *Eugenius* 4. by the Council of *Baſil*. By which is ſufficiently proved, *The tyrannical dominion of the Biſhops of Rome in Spirituals*, ſince all of that Church are bound to believe that as an Article of Faith which he teacheth, although he ſhould *teach Hereſie, call good evil, and evil good*: As appears by that blaſphemous gloſs, *In caput quanto perſonam de tranſlatione Epiſcopi in decretalibus*. Where it is affirmed that none ſhould preſume to call in queſtion what the *Pope* doth? Since he hath an *Heavenly arbitriment, can change the nature of things, make Juſtice Injuſtice, Injuſtice Juſtice?* Which if it be not tyrannical domination none is imaginable: the words of the gloſs are theſe following, *Papa habet cæleſte arbitrium, & ideo naturam rerum mutare, poteſt ſubſtantialia unius rei applicando alij, & de nullo poſſe aliquid facere, & ſententiam quæ nulla eſt, facere aliquam: in his quæ vult ei eſſe pro ratione voluntatem: nec eſſe qui ei dicat, cur ita facis? Poteſt enim ſuprajus diſpenſare, & de injuſtitia fa-*

cere justitiam, corrigendo jura, & mutando: demum plenitudinem obtinet potestatis. It shal be proved likewise, *part. 4. lib. 1.* that he gives pardons for money, for sins to be committed for so many years to come. And thus much of his *tyrannical dominion in Spirituals*, which was the first particular.

The second particular of his *tyrannical dominion*, is in *Temporals*. Authority of deposing Kings, is attributed unto him, it is taught by the Church of *Rome*, that the *Pope* hath power to absolve Subjects from their Oaths of fidelity to their natural Princes; to command them to fight against them, and consequently to kill them: that all are oblieged to acknowledge him for their natural Prince whom the *Pope* shal appoint. It is taught also in that Church, *That the Pope is direct Monarch of the whole World, both in Spirituals and Temporals.* So *Bozius, lib. 10. de signis Ecclesiæ*, and *Carerius de potestate Papæ*, and all the *Canonists* they teach also, *That a Pope deposing a King without any reason, but his will, doth him no wrong, because he takes only what is his own from him: As a King doth no wrong to the Governor of a Province, when he gives his government to another Subject.* Although the former have done no offence, as is maintained by *Thomas Bozius, lib. 3. cap 4: de jure status.*

Here our *Romish Emissaries* in *Scotland* endeavor to perswade their Proselytes that this doctrine of deposing Kings, is not the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, but only of some particular Persons, whom they call the *Popes* Flatterers.

But is replyed, that those *Gentle-men* are either not well versed in their own principles, or else they are like *Father Cotton* the *Jesuite*, who being demanded by the Parliament of *Paris, If he believed that the Popes had power to depose Kings?* Answered, *He did not believe it in* France, *but if he were at* Rome, *he would believe it.* However that it is to the doctrine of the

the Church of *Rome*. that the *Pope* hath power to depoſe Kings; is proved by theſe following reaſons, which will puzle thoſe gentlemen very ſore to anſwer. The firſt is this, innumerable Books are Printed teaching this doctrine, and yet are Printed *by authority and licence, as containing no doctrine, contrair to the true Catholick* doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. Ergo, *the depoſing of Kings by the Pope is the true Catholick doctrine of the Church of Rome*: ſince a doctrine which is not contrary to the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, muſt of neceſſity be the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*.

The ſecond reaſon is this, All the Roman Doctors unanimouſly maintain, (except ſome few who dare not ſet out their Head) *that whatever the Pope and his Cardinals diſcern in a Conclave, is of equal (if not of a Superior) Authority, with that which is decreed in a General Council*; but the Conclave at *Rome* gives unto the Pope power of depoſing Kings: *Ergo*, it is the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. That ſuch power is given to the Pope by the Conclave, appears by innumerable bulls, *as that of* Gregory 7. *againſt* Henry *the* 4. Emperor. *That of* Paul *the third, againſt* Henry *the* 8. *of* England. *Of* Paul *the* 5. *againſt Queen* Elizabeth. *Of* Sixtus *the* 5. *againſt* Henry 3. *and* 4. *Kings of France*.

The third reaſon is this, Every one is bound to believe that to be the true Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, *which the Pope teacheth in Cathedra*, in which caſe they maintain he is infallible; But the *Pope* teacheth in *Cathedra*, that he hath power *to depoſe Kings* by his decretal bulls, obliging the whole Church (as is notorious) in which he aſſums to himſelf *that power*, as appears by innumerable of his Bulls, eſpecially by thoſe now mentioned againſt the Emperor, Kings of *England* & *France*: in which, he expreſly aſſumes unto himſelf authority of *building*, or *ædificandi*; *of caſting down*, or *demoliendi*; *of planting*, *plantandi*; *of rooting out*, *eradicandi*, *transferendi*, *of transferring*, *Kingdoms at his*

his pleasure. In some of which Bulls also, he applyeth to himself those words of the Prophet, *Per me Reges regnant, By me Kings reign*: which is notorious blasphemy. And thus we have proved, against those Gentlemen, that they are mistaken, in denying that is the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, which giveth authority unto the *Pope*, to *depose Kings*.

They are not yet satisfied, as appears by two objections, made by one of those Gentlemen to my self: The first was this, that I could not instruct, that it was *the Doctrine of any General Council, that the* Pope *hath power to depose Kings*: and consequently I could not make out, it was the doctrine of the whole Church of *Rome*. To which objection I answered First, that I had made it out, *That it was the doctrine of* Popes *in Cathedra*, and consequently I had made it out, *that he and all other Romanists, were obliged to believe it as an Article of Faith.* He told me plainly, he did much doubt of that, neither was he of that opinion, *That the Pope could not err in cathedra*, but still pressed me to prove it by the Authority of some General Council; protesting he detested that doctrine as unsound. I desired him to read *Baronius, anno* 1072. and he would find, *that the* Emperor, Henry *the* 4. *was exautorated by a Council at* Rome, *num.* 16, 17, 18. and by another at *Collen*, 1118. *num.* 20. and by another at *Fritislar, ibid.*

The Gentleman answered very pertinently, That these were only petty *particular Councils*: but he desired the authority of a *General Council*. I desired him to read *Baronius, ad an. num* 1102. *num.* 1, 2, 3. and also the same Author, 1116. *num* 5. and also *anno* 1119. Where he will find that doctrine *to be the doctrine of General Councils*, especially, that of *Lateran, anno* 1116. *is called a General Council by Baronius.* Likewise I desired him to read *Bzovius, anno* 1245. *num.* 4. *The Council of* Lions. *in the tombs of Councils, tom.* 28. *pag.* 431. *The decretals sext de sententiâ & re judicata (ad Apostolicæ*

where

where he would find, that the Emperor *Frederick* the ſecond was deprived, or declared to be deprived, and his ſubjects quit from their *Oaths of Allegiance* by *Innocentius* 4. in the *Council* of *Lions*. I deſired him alſo to read an Act of a General Council at *Lateran*, under *Innocent third*, where he would find that doctrine, or that power of *Depoſing Kings*, attributed to the Pope: which Act he would find in *Bzovius*, *anno* 1215. *Paragraph* 3. *in Binnius* and *Crab in their collection of Councils*, C. 13. *and in Gregorius*, *de haret.* C. *excommunicamus*.

I deſired him alſo to read, *Seſ.* 25. *Canon* 19. of the Council of *Trent*, where he would find that power of the Popes ſo intelligibly aſſerted, and *conſequentially* (although not expreſly) that it was one of the main reaſons for which the Kingdom of *France* ſtood out againſt that Council of *Trent*, rejecting its Authority. By the ſaid Canon, any *Dominus fundi is deprived of the Dominion of it*, *if a duel be fought in it*: *and ſince a King is comprehended* under *Dominus fundi*, the Council takes upon it, *to deprive him of a part of his Kingdom*: but if they have power to deprive him of a part, by the ſame reaſon, they take upon them power to take his whole Kingdom from him. And this way I anſwered his firſt objection, *viz.* that it could be inſtructed by Act of no Council, *that the Pope had power to depoſe Kings*, and conſequently it was not the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*.

His ſecond objection was, that notwithſtanding all this, it was not the doctrine of the whole Church of *Rome*, becauſe all the Church of *France* rejected it as a pernicious doctrine.

I anſwered this objection by a two-fold diſtinction. The firſt of times, *viz. When the King of France was low*, *and the* Pope *high*. The ſecond diſtinction was *of cauſes*, wherefore *Kings are depoſed?* one of which, and the main one was *hereſie*. I deſired him to read hiſtory, and he would find, that when the Kings of *France were low*, *and their Kings ſuſpected of Hereſie*

hereſie, that it was the doctrine of the whole Clergy of *France*, that the *Pope had power of depoſing ſuch Kings at ſuch times*: for proving of which, I deſired him to read firſt a *decree of the Sorbon*, printed at *Paris*, in which they approved the bulls of *Sixtus* 5. excommunicating and depoſing *Henry* 3 & 4. Kings of *France*. I deſired him ſecondly to read that ſpeech of *Cardinal Peron*, in the name of the Clergy of *France*, as their Speaker in an Aſſembly of the Eſtates: in which ſpeech, he openly maintains, *That it is the opinion of the whole Church of* France, *and ever was, that Heretical Kings* (that is Proteſtants) ought to *be depoſed: that the* Pope *had power to depoſe them: and that true French-men ought them no allegiance.* And thus much of the Popes power in temporals *by the way*: it ſhal be more largely diſputed (God willing) *part.* 3. *lib.* 2 what we have ſaid is ſufficient to prove, *That the Dominion of the Biſhop of Rome is tyrannical*, and conſequently, according to their own confeſſion forbidden, *Peter* 1. 5, 3.

The third particular of the *tyrannical Domination* of the Biſhop of *Rome*, is *over ſouls departed.*

The fourth is over *Angels.* Both which uſurpations appear by the Bull of *Clement* ſixth *proclaiming a Jubile*, The words of the Bull are theſe, *Concedimus, ſi confeſſus in via moriatur, ut ab omnibus peccatis ſuis ſit immunis penitus & abſolutus: & mandamus Angelis, ut animam è purgatorio penitùs abſolutam, in Paradiſi gloriam introducant.* And in another Bull, *Nolumus ut pœna inferni illi infligatur, concedens cruce ſignatis, ad eorum vota tres aut quatuor animas, quas volunt ex purgatorio poſſe eripere*: in which Bulls he takes upon him to command Angels, and to *place Souls in heaven or hell as he pleaſeth.*

The 5. particular, proving the tyranny of the dominon of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, is, *in aſſuming divin power to himſelf*: So *Nicolaus* 2. in *Gratianus diſt.* 96. (*Satis evidenter.* Where he

he affirms, *That the Pope cannot be Judged by any Secular Prince, becauſe the Pope was called God by* Conſtantine, *but God cannot be judged by man.* Likewiſe, *Bonifacius*, 8. 6. *decret. de electione* C. *fundamenta*, affirms, That *S. Peter was aſſumed in the fellowſhip of the individual Trinity*: and conſequently, *the Biſhop of Rome hath the ſame priviledge, as Peters Succeſſor.* So *Gloſſa extravag.* C. *antiquæ de voto.* Where ſpeaking of *Matrimony* held by the Church of *Rome*, to be a *Sacrament of divine Inſtitution*; a doubt is moved, how that vow made in *Matrimony*, can be diſſolved by a Conſtitution of the Church? Since it was made ſolemnly to God. The Gloſſator anſwers the doubt, That it cannot be made void by *a meer man*: but only by the *Pope, who is not a meer man, but Gods Vicar.* Thirdly, he uſurps Divinity in making the *Decretal Epiſtles, or the Canon law of equal authority with the Scripture.* So *Gratianus, diſtinct.* 19. C. *in Canonicis* expreſly affirms ſo much. Innumerable examples might be afforded of this kind, but thoſe are ſufficient.

The ſixth and laſt particular of the *Tyranny* of the *Domination* of the Biſhop of *Rome* is, *his hearing, patientiſſimis auribus, without offence, blaſphemous titles attributed to him in Orations, Books, and Pamphlets* printed by his *Authority*: which is all one, as he had ſtiled himſelf by thoſe titles. So by the Gloſs in the Canon Law, he is called *our Lord God the Pope*, as is found in thoſe Editions printed at *Lions* 1584. and at *Paris* 1585. 1601. 1612. All which Editions were ſet out after *Gregory* 13. had corrected the Canon Law: the words are, *Credere Dominum Deum noſtrum Papam, Conditorem dictæ decretalis, non ſic potuiſſe ſtatuere, prout ſtatuit, hæreticum cenſeatur*; *extravagant, John* 22. *tit.* 14. *de verb. ſig. cap.* 4. *&c.* We could produce innumerable ſuch, but it were tedious; yet we cannot omit that blaſphemous Pamphlet, preſented to *Innocent* the 10. who before his Popedom was called *Cardinal Pamphilius.* The ſcope of which Pamphlet is to compare the

Pope, whom he calleth *Pamphilius*, with *Christ*, whom he calleth *Philius*. To be short, he preferrs the Pope to Christ in most horrible manner: and yet the Pope was no wise offended at this flattery: It seems, he understood not what Blasphemy meant; for an other time being desired to hear a Theological Controversie between the *Jansenists*, and *Molinists* disputed before him, that he might determin it; He answered, *He was an old man, it did not belong to his profession, and he had never studied Divinity*, as is reported by *S. Amour* in his *journal*, where he affirms, He heard the Pope affirm so publickly. And thus much of *Peter* 1. 5. 3. The first Argument of *Protestants* against *Peters* institution of Oecumenick Bishop, we have proved two things in the vindication of that passage. The first is, that not only *tyrannical Domination, but all sort of Domination* is forbidden in that place. The second is, although it were granted, that only *tyrannical Domination in Church-men were forbidden in the same place*: yet it quite overthrows the institution of an Oecumenick Bishop, which we have proved to be *most tyrannical*, and that by six arguments, which in effect, amongst Candide men are unanswerable.

CHAP. XII.

The Supremacy of Peter *assaulted, from* Ephesians 1. 22. & 4. 23. & 5. 23. *And* Colossians 1 18.

IN the former Chapter we assaulted the *Institution of Peter in that Oecumenick Bishoprick*, by the testimony of *Peter* himself, forbidding all sort of *Lording* or *Domination* in *Church men*: where we also proved two things. First that not only *tyrannical Domination* was forbidden by the Apostle in *Church Rulers*, but *all Domination*. Secondly, although *tyrannical Lording* had only been forbidden; nevertheless the in-

injunction of the Apostle inhibited, *That Lording assumed by the Bishop of* Rome *now to himself:* proving by demonstrative arguments, *that the power of the Bishop of* Rome *now-a-dayes, was not only tyrannical, but blasphemous, and a right-down Gigantomachy:* which shal more largely be proved, *part.* 4. *lib.* 1. In this following chapter, we make use of a second *argument* against the institution of *Peter* in that *universal Bishoprick* by Christ: *viz.* it appears by these Scriptures mentioned in the title, *That Christ is the Head of the Church:* and if *Peter* were by divine Institution *Oecumenick Bishop*, the Church would have two heads, since our adversaries maintain, that an Oecumenick Bishop *is head of the Church.*

They answer to this difficulty, varying one from another, some one way, some another, some the third way, others the fourth. It will not be unpleasing to examine their Sophistry. The first answer is of *Bellarmin* distinguishing: *The Church*, saith he, *cannot have two principal Heads, nevertheless it may have two heads, whereof the one is subordinat to the other.* In a word he answers, *Christ* is *Caput primarium Ecclesiæ, primary head of the Church, Peter*, and his Successors, the Bishops of *Rome* are *Capita secundaria*, or *secundary heads.* But this distinction of *Bellarmins* is both against Scripture and Antiquity: It is against Scripture, which calling Christ *the head of the Church*, and the *Church the body of Christ*, doth so by a *Metaphor* taken from a *humane body*: and, as a humane body cannot have two heads, one subordinat to another, that the similitude may hold, the Church cannot have two heads.

Secondly, this plurality of *heads* in the *Church* is against Antiquity. *Gregorius Magnus, lib.* 4. *epist.* 36. *directed to Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria*, exclaims most bitterly against *John Bishop of Constantinople*, taking upon him to be *head of the Church under Christ*: neither is it of any moment what some object, *that Gregory doth not inveigh against the title it self of*

Oecumenick Bishop, but only against John Patriarch of Constantinople, *for usurping to himself that title, Head of the Church: which did not belong unto him, but to the Bishop of* Rome, as Successor to *Peter*. We affirm this solution is Black Sophistry, because *Gregory* disputs generally against *all who presume to take upon them that title, whether Bishops of* Rome *or not*, as appears by his general reason. He argumenteth thus:

He is proud and arrogant, and a fore-runner of Antichrist, and like Lucifer, exalting himself above the other Angels, who takes upon him that which is proper to Christ, or belongs to Christ only.

But he who takes upon him to be head of the Church, *takes that upon him which belongs only to* Christ: Ergo.

By which reasoning of *Gregorius*, it is evident, that he disputs against all who take upon them to be *secundary heads of the* Church, *Bishop of* Rome, and all: his reason militats no less against the *Bishop of Rome*, then against him of *Constantinople*: and in his 38. *Epistle*, he ingeminats the same reason, *viz. That those who take upon them to be Head of the* Church *under* Christ, *will not be able to hold up their face at the last day: because in so doing, they took upon them that title which belonged only to Christ*: which title also, *Gregory* in several other of his *Epistles*, *calls new, Blasphemous, against the mandats of* Christ, *Canons of the Apostles, Constitutions of the Church, &c.* Which testimonies of *Gregory* shal be examined hereafter, and vindicated from the sophistries of *Bellarmin*, *Baronius*, and others.

This secundary head, is also assaulted by *Basilius* in *Ascetic.* in the *Proœm*, where he calls Christ *the only head of the* Church. And thus ye have the opinion of *Basilius*, and *Gregorius*, both called *the Great*, that a *Secundary Head* of the Church, is an Antichristian fiction, since they thunder so against it in the person of any one man: none can be so ignorant,

as

as to think, that *Gregorious* exclaimed against *John*, for taking on him that title of *caput primarium*: *Ergo*, the thing he disputs against, is that *caput secundarium, defended now by Bellarmin.*

Bellarmin nevertheless disputs for that *secundary head*, three wayes. First, because it is no wayes *injurious to Christ*. Secondly, because it *illustrats the glory of Christ*. Thirdly, because *it is necessar to the Church*. Let us hear how he pleads? And first, how he proves it *is not contumelious to Christ?* His argument is this, Many *titles of Christ* are communicated to men, such as *Pastor, Bishop, Apostle, Prophet, Light, Foundation*: Yea, and the *title of God himself*; and yet no injury is done to Christ, when men are called *Apostles, Pastors, Doctors*, and *Gods, &c. Ergo*, no injury is done to Christ, when a man is called *Head of the Church under Him*. And consequently, a *secundary Head of the Church* is no wayes contrair to Scripture.

But it is answered, First, we have warrand in Scripture for these other titles, attributed to both Christ and men: but we have no warrand in Scripture to call any man *Head of the Church*. By which it appears, that our Savior hath reserved that title to himself alone. It is great presumption in any man to take upon him that title belonging to Christ, without any warrand. Secondly, those other titles cõmunicated to men, which are attributed to Christ principally, may be compared to those *titles*, which are common to a King, and his Subjects: Some of which without any derogation to the King at all, may be communicated to the Subject: as *Noble, Rich, Powerful, Lord, Magistrat, &c.* But none of the *Subjects* can be called *Kings*. Just so, in these titles common to Christ with men, no wrong is done to Christ, when they are called *Lights, Foundations, Apostles, Doctors, Prophets, &c.* But the title of *head of the church* can no more be cõmunicated to a man, then the title of a King to a subject. *Head of the church* is the King-

dom

dom of Christ. Thirdly, those other titles objected by *Bellarmin*, common to Christ & other men, are not properly attributed to both: but *properly* to the one, & *Figuratively* or *Metaphorically* to the other: So these titles which are properly attributed to Christ, are attributed to men improperly, and *secundum homonymiam*. And again, these titles that are *proper* to men, are in the same manner *improperly* attributed to Christ: But *Bellarmin*, and his Fellows maintain, that the title of *Head of the Church* belongs properly both to Christ, and men, as the title of a *King* properly belongs to both. Now let us examine those titles objected by *Bellarmin* more particularly.

And First, *Pastor*, *Apostle*, *Bishop*, *Prophet*, these titles are attributed to men, without any injury to Christ: because these titles belong properly to men, and from them translated to Christ: and since our Savior demits himself voluntarily, to these titles, it is no injury to him, though they be attributed to him, *Metaphorically* and *Abusively*.

In the next place, are *Light* and *Foundation*, which according to an *Homonymy* are attributed to Christ and to men. And first, *Light*, if it were attributed to them both properly, the assertion of *John* the *Apostle* would be false, affirming, *That John Baptist was not the Light, but only Christ*; by whom it appears also, that Christ was called the *Light*, because he illuminats; men are called *Lights* because they are *illuminated*. So *Cyrillus*, *Thomas Aquinas*, and *Augustinus* upon the place: which last affirms, that the Apostle called our *Savior the true Light, because he was that Light which illuminats: men were only called Lights, because they were illuminated by him, and therefore are not the true Lights*: And since Christ is the *true Light*, and men are not the *true Lights*; it is evident, that the title of *Light* is attributed to both by a *Homonymy*.

In the next place comes *Foundation*, *Prophets* and *Apostles* are

are called *Foundations* two wayes. And firſt, *Tertullianus*, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 39. againſt *Marcion*, *Chryſoſtomus*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylactus*, interpret theſe words of *Paul*, *ſuper fundamenta Prophetarum & Apoſtolorum*, as if the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* themſelves were *Foundations*: But it is certain they cannot be called ſo, but only by reaſon of their *Miniſtry*: that is, in ſo far as they were *Miniſters of founding Churches*, as is confeſſed by *Juſtinianus* the *Jeſuite*, who affirms, That the faith of the *Epheſians*, *was built upon the teſtimony of the Old and New Teſtament*, that is by a *Metonymy*; but Chriſt is not that way called *Foundation*: and therefore the title of *Foundation* is attributed by a *Homonymy* to *Chriſt*, and the *Apoſtles* and *Prophets*; and in that ſenſe the Apoſtle *Paul* denyeth that there is any *Foundation* but Chriſt.

Others interpret the meaning of *Paul*, calling the *Apoſtles* and *Prophets*, *Foundations* to be that they *preached the Doctrine of the Old and New Teſtament*, *which is the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets*; *viz. which they did lay*. So the interlinear and ordinar gloſs, following *Ambroſius*, and *Anſelmus*: ſo alſo *Lyranus*, *Aquinas*, *Lombardus*, *Cajetanus*, *Gagnæus* the *Jeſuite*, and *Salmero*. In what ever ſenſe *Foundation* be taken, it is properly attributed to Chriſt, improperly by a *Homonymy* to men.

Bellarmins laſt tittle is *GOD*: Men are called *Gods*, ſaith he, *Pſalm* 82. and ſince they are ſo called, why may not a man be called *Head of the Church*?

But it is anſwered: Firſt, *Kings* and *Judges* are not called *Gods* there, but only that *men judged ſo of them*, becauſe of their flouriſhing eſtate: ſo that, *Ego dixi*, *Dii eſtis*, are not the words of *GOD*, but of the *Pſalmiſt* himſelf, as d vers learned men gather from the text. Others think that the *Pſalmiſt* is ſpeaking of the *Angels*. However, albeit the title of *GOD* were attributed to *Kings* and *Judges*; it doth not follow, that the title

title of *Head of the Church*, may be attributed to men: becauſe the title of *GOD* is attributed to men *abuſively*, by a too high ſtrained *Metaphor*: But *Bellarmin* and his fellows endeavor to maintain that the *Biſhop* of *Rome is properly head of the Church, as a King is head of his Kingdom*: And in this manner *Bellarmin* undertakes to prove, that it is not injurious to Chriſt, that any ſhould take upon him the title of *Head of the Church*.

In the next place, he goes a ſtep higher, endeavoring to prove, *That a viſible head of the Church, ſets forth the glory of Chriſt, as the glory of a King is augmented by a Victory.*

But it is anſwered, When a *Viceroy* intruds himſelf without a Commiſſion upon a Province; he is ſo far from ſetting forth the glory of his King, that he eclipſeth it, by neglecting of his authority, and proves a Rebel. Let *Bellarmin* inſtruct if he can, in what place of Scripture, any hath commiſſion to be *viſible head of the Church under Chriſt?* We proved in the former chapters, that what he alledged in the behalf of *Peter*, was new deviſed *Sophiſtry*, contradicting *Scripture*, *Antiquity*, and of no great moment, to prove the ſupremacy of *Peter*, in the opinion of the moſt learned Antiquaries, which ever the Church of *Rome* produced. Secondly, *Bellarmins viſible head of the Church*, carrys himſelf not like a *Viceroy*, but like a King, which muſt be injurious to the *true Head of the Church*: Yea, *Bellarmin* himſelf endeavors to prove, that the *ſaid ſecondary head reigns in the Church, as a King doth in a Kingdom*: Neither can the Biſhop of *Rome* be ſaid to be *Viceroy* to *Chriſt*, otherwiſe in the government of the Church, then a King is *Viceroy* to GOD, in the government of a Kingdom. But Kings are abſolute, and not *Viceroys*, and therefore that *viſible head of the Church* is abſolute alſo, being ſubordinate no otherwiſe to Chriſt, then Kings are to GOD. Thirdly, when a *Viceroy* takes upon him to go beyond his commiſſion

commiſſion, or to govern contrair to the law of his King, he wrongs the authority of his King, and no wayes ſets forth his glory. But *Bellarmins viſible and ſecundary head* takes upon him, to diſpence with the Law of GOD (as we ſhewed in the former chapter) proving that he took power upon him, to *make Juſtice Injuſtice, and Injuſtice Juſtice.*

In the third place, *Bellarmin* goes a ſtep higher yet, and endeavors to prove that a *ſecundary viſible head* is neceſſar for the Church: becauſe, ſaith he, in the abſence of Chriſt, *the Church cannot be contained in Unity, unleſs it be governed by one viſible head under Chriſt.*

But it is anſwered, *Still good*: that aſſertion of *Bellarmins*, if not *blaſphemous*, is notoriouſly falſe: *viz. That the Church cannot be contained in Unity by Chriſt alone, unleſs a viſible head be joyned with him*: Which contradicts Scripture, which in every place attributes the cauſe of that Unity, of the *Church to Chriſt alone*: So *John* 17. *That they may be one in us*, and Rom. 10. *We many are one body in Chriſt*: and Gal. 3. *Ye are all one in Chriſt*; and the reaſon is evident, becauſe that Unity is Spiritual, *Epheſ.* 4. *Studying to keep the unity of the Spirit*; See alſo 1. *Corinth.* 12. and *Philip* 1. By which places it appears, that the Inviſible and Spiritual preſence of Chriſt alone, preſerves the Church in Unity, which is alſo granted by many & famous *Roman Doctors*, who prove the infallibility of the Church, to depend upon this promiſe of Chriſt, *viz. That he would be preſent with them to the end of the World.*

We have heard *Bellarmin* diſputing for a *viſible head*, and proving that it is not *derogatory to the honor of Chriſt*: We will now examine an argument of *Sanderus*, that famous *Engliſh Jeſuite*, who proves, that it conduceth to the glory of Chriſt, that the Church ſhould have a *viſible head*: becauſe, ſaith he, *More ways of Preaching that glory of Chriſt, are by a*

visible head then without it. But it is answered, (to omit the inconsequence of that argument) we deny the Antecedent, or distinguisheth it, *viz.* These ways of Preaching Christ, only illustrat his glory which are ordained by himself: which a *visible head* is not. *Sanderus* instances, Rulers of particular Churches, or Bishops, are called *Heads* of their respective Churches under Christ, by *Gregorius Magnus* and other Fathers: *Ergo*, why may there not be one *visible head of all the Church under Christ?* But it is answered, First, if *Sanderus* had objected that argument to *Gregorius Magnus* himself, he would have denyed it to follow: for although he seems to call *Bishops heads of particular Churches*, yet he detests an *universal head* (as we shewed before) *as injurious to Christ.* Secondly, when *Gregorius* calls *Bishops heads of the Church*, he speaks *abusively* and *improperly*, and without any warrand in Scripture.

And thus we have shewed hitherto, how *Bellarmin* and *Sanderus* have endeavored to prove, that it is not inconsistent with the Church, to have *two heads*: because, the one is a *Primary head*, the other *a Secundary head*. *Panigarola*, *lectione 6.* useth a very strange argument, to prove, that the Church of necessity, must have a *visible head* beside *Christ*: Otherwise, saith he, *It would be a monster, if a visible body as the Church had only an invisible head, which is Christ.* But it is answered: First, the Church will be no less a monster, if it have *two heads*; one *visible*, another *invisible*. Secondly, *Panigarola* speaks blasphemy, which we bind upon him by this argument: First, *All bodies visible, having an invisible head are monstrous bodies.* This *Panigarola* grants. Secondly, *The Church is no monstrous body.* This he grants also: how can he then deny this conclusion in *Baroco*: *Ergo, The Church hath not an invisible head, or Christ is not head of the Church*, which is right-down blasphemy.

Alphonsus

Alphonsus de Castro, puzled with the difficulty of two *heads*, hath a distinction of his own, of *two bodies*: as *Bellarmin* made a distinction of *two heads*. *De Castro*, denies *That body of which Christ is the head, to be the same with that body which hath a visible head, or Peter, or the Bishop of Rome for its head.* He explains himself thus, the Church may be called a body two ways, saith he. First, as it is a *total body*. Secondly, as it is a *Mystical body*. The first way is, when it is considered, comprehending all the *Members* with Christ: and in that sense, *Christ is head of the Church*. In the second way it is considered, *as a body consisting of all the other members* (*Christ excluded*) and in that acception, *Peter* or his Successors, are *visible heads of the Church*: So the Church cannot be said to have *two heads*; for *Christ*, and *Peter* and his *Successors*, *are not heads of the same body*, *but of diverse*. Christ is head of the Church, as it is a *total body*, *Peter*, and his Successors as it is a *Mystical body*.

But it is answered, *Alphonsus de Castro* (as cannot be denyed) was a brave learned man, and stood as little awe of the *Pope*, to speak his mind when truth required, as any Doctor of that Church: yet this distinction of his of a *body in total*, and *mystical*, is used by no body but himself: it is also contrair to Scripture, which in every place, *where the Church is called the body of Christ*, considers it, *as containing all other members*, *Christ excluded*: And so the Scripture never mentions that body, which *de Castro* calls a *total body*. For the Scripture, *calling the Church the body of Christ*, means no other body, then that which *de Castro* calls *mystical*. This distinction of *de Castro* might be solidly refuted otherwise; but it is needless to insist, since it is owned by no others, except by *Spondanus*, who seems to come very near it thus.

The Apostle saith he, *Ephes.* 4. affirms *Christ to be the head from which the whole body takes increment*. He observeth,

First, that Christ is distinguished from the *whole body*, which is the Church: *Ergo*, saith he, since the Church is a *whole body without Christ*, *it must of necessity have a head beside Christ*, *otherways it could not be a whole body*, since no *body* can be whole without a *head*. And therefore the Church hath a *visible head*, proportionable to it self beside Christ, since it is a whole body without Christ.

But it is answered, He is a notorious Sophister: First, when the Apostle, *Ephesians* 4. *opposeth the whole body to Christ*, under the name of *body*, or *whole body*, *he comprehends all the other members only*, *beside the head*, *and not as having a head of its own*: As appears by the *Commentaries* not only of the Fathers upon that place, *Ephes.* 4. such as *Chrysostom*, and his admirer *Theophylactus*, and *Theodoretus*, but also by the expositions of *Justinian* and *Salmero* two famous *Jesuites*, upon that place, *Ephesians* 4. All which, expounding what the Apostle calls, *totum corpus*, or, *the whole body*, interpret it to be these members, *Quæ à capite sensum accipiunt*, or, *have influence of sense*, *or life from the head*: And consequently, they make *totum corpus*, *the whole body*, to be no other thing, *then all the other members*, *the head excluded*: and consequently, *totum corpus*, *the whole body*, hath not an other *head* beside *Christ*.

Secondly, By *totum corpus*, *or whole body*, questionless the Apostle means the *Church*, as it comprehends both the *Church Militant*, and the *Church Triumphant*. *Spondanus* argument, if it conclude at all, must of necessity conclude, that *the said visible head is head of the Church Triumphant*: and so the *Bishop of Rome*, *must be head of the Church Triumphant* also which none will affirm.

Thirdly, The ground of this distinction of *Spondanus*, is notoriously false, *viz*, *That the head would not be proportional to the body*, *except it were visible*. For to omit that Christ is constantly

conſtantly *called the Head of the Church in Scripture*, which ſhould be enough to ſtop the mouth of *Spondanus*; our Savior is a *proportional Head to the Church*, becauſe, *he is a man like unto us in all things, except ſin.*

We will conclude this diſput *of Head of the Church* with one Argument, uſed by ſome Proteſtants againſt a *Viſible Head of the Church*; which is this, *If the Church had any other Head but Chriſt, it would be called the body of the ſaid Head*: but it is never called *the body of any Head, but of Chriſt*: Ergo, *It hath no other Head but Chriſt.*

Bellarmin anſwers two wayes: And firſt he affirms, That the Church is not *called the body of that viſible Head*, becauſe it is only *Secundary*, and not *Primary*: and therefore, the Church is only *called the body of Chriſt.*

But it is replyed, If there were any ſuch thing, as that *ſecundary head*, the Church could with no leſs reaſon be called *its body*, then it could be called *head of the church*. Since the relation is reciprocal, and the body is no leſs the body of the Head, then the head is the head of the body: and ſince the Church is no where called the body of that *ſecundary head*, it is evident, that the ſaid ſecundary head is a fiction.

Bellarmin urgeth, that a King is the Head of his Kingdom, and the Kingdom may be called his body: likewiſe, a *Viceroy* may be called *ſecundary Head* of the Kingdom or Province: but the Kingdom or Province, cannot be called the body of a *Viceroy*, and in like manner, the Church cannot be called *the body of that ſecundary Head*, the Biſhop of *Rome*, or *Peter.*

But it is replyed, As *the Viceroy is head of the Province*, ſo the Province may be called *the body or Province of the Viceroy*: but ſince the Church cannot be called *the body of that ſecundary head*, as *Bellarmin* confeſſeth, it is evident, there is no ſuch ſecundary head at all in the Church.

Secondly, *Bellarmin* grants, that the *Kingdom may be called the*

the body or Kingdom of the King: but he endeavors to prove, that the *said secundary head reigns in the Church, as a King doth in a Kingdom*: and therefore the Church may be called the body of the said secundary head, if there were any such thing. But since the Church is no where called the *body of that secundary head*, it is evident, that the said secundary head is a meer fiction. *Bellarmin* gives a reason, wherefore the Province is not called the body of the *Viceroy*? but only of the King, *viz.* because the Governor of a Province is not *perpetual*, but only *for a time*. And for the same reason, the Church is not called the body of that secundary head, because it is not *perpetual*, but only for *a time*. But this reason is frivolous, because, that *secundary head of the Church* is as perpetual, as a King in a Kingdom: and therefore the Church may be called as well body of that *secundary head*, as a Kingdom is called *the body of a King*. But since in Scripture, the Church is no where called the body of that secundary Head; it is evident, it is a fiction, *viz.* that *secundary head*, which is further confirmed. *Bellarmin* affirms also, That the Province cannot be said to be the Province of the *Viceroy*, because he is not *absolute*: but it may be called the Province of the King, because he is *absolute*, and depends upon none but God. But that *secundary head of the Church* depends upon none but Christ: and therefore the Church may as well be called *his body*, and *Church*, as a Kingdom may be called *Kingdom of the King*. But since the Church is no where called body of that secundary head, it is evident, that the said secundary head is but a fiction.

Bellarmin pressed with those difficulties, flies to another distinction, *viz.* that the Church is called the body of Christ, not *in relation to Christ, as head*, but only as it is referred to Christ, *as a great hypostasis*: as when *Peter* or *Paul* is lying any where, we may affirm, *There lyes the body of Peter*: *there lyes the body of Paul*. In which sense, body comprehends *head and*

and all, and is not conſidered, as diſtinct from the Head and other members.

Bellarmin, by this device doth not take away the difficulty, for two reaſons. The firſt is, although it were granted that the Church were called the body of Chriſt, as the word *Chriſt* is a *Hypoſtaſis*, *comprehending both heads and members*: in which ſenſe, the body of *Peter*, or *Paul may be called their body*, and not their *head*; ---- we ſay, Although that were granted, yet *Bellarmin* will not deny, that the Church is called the body of Chriſt, ſometimes, *as it is referred to Chriſt as head*: and therefore, if there were any *Secundary head*, *the Church would be called its bodie in that reſpect alſo*: which ſince it is not, it is evident, that there is no ſuch thing as a *ſecundary head*.

The ſecond reaſon is, that it is falſe which *Bellarmin* affirms, that ever the Church is called the body of Chriſt, in that ſenſe of *great hypoſtaſis*: it hath neither ground in Scripture, nor Antiquity: it is only deviſed by *Bellarmin* himſelf, who abuſeth Scripture, and a paſſage of *Auguſtinus* to prove it. The place of Scripture is 1 *Corinth.* 12. *verſe* 12. Where the Apoſtle affirms, *That all the members of the bodie, although they be many, yet are but one bodie, even ſo is Chriſt*: which makes nothing for him; for the Apoſtle there means no ſuch thing, as *Bellarmin* affirms, citing *Auguſtinus* falſly to prove it. *Auguſtins* words are, *Non dixit ita & Chriſti, id eſt, corpus Chriſti, vel membra Chriſti: ſed ita & Chriſtus unum Chriſtum appellens caput & corpus*, as he would ſay, The Apoſtle *called Chriſt, which is the head of the Church, and the Church which is the bodie of Chriſt, one Chriſt*: which he had foolishly affirmed, if that had been the Apoſtles mind, that the Church is called the body of Chriſt, as the body of *Peter* and *Paul* lying any where, comprehending the head alſo. And thus much of that famous diſput of the *head of the Church*. We have ſeen how *Bellarmin* vexeth himſelf to find out diſtinctions to maintain that

that *secundary head*, and to show why the Church is not called the Body of that *secundary head?* But the Roman Doctors of late maintain, that the Church is, and may be called the *body of that secundary head*, seeing that *Bellarmins* distinctions would not serve the turn.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Hierarchy of the Church, Ephesians 4.

WE have prosecuted two Arguments against the institution of the Supremacy of *Peter:* now followeth the third, which is this, *If Peter had been ordained by our Savior Monarch of the* Church, *then the Apostles themselves, and these who lived in their times, delineating the Hierarchy of the* Church, *would have mentioned it, or affirmed, That the Government of the Church was monarchical, under one visible head. But both the Apostles themselves, and those who are confessed by our adversaries, to have lived in the times of the Apostles, delineating the Hierarchy of the Church, put ever still more persons then one of equal authority in the highest place of the Hierarchie:* whereby it is evident to any, who is not wilfully blinde, that the *Government* of the Church was not by Christs Institution Monarchical.

And first, the Apostle *Paul, Ephes.* 4. enumerating the *Hierarchie* of the Church, *verse* 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. hath these words, *He that descended, is even the same that ascended, far above all heavens, that he might fill all things. He therefore gave some to be Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers.* In which words ye have the *Hierarchy* of the *Church*, consisting of several degrees, in every degree many persons: *the highest degree*, is that of the *Apostles*

Apostles: which are also *many*, or in the *Plural number*, whereby it is evident, that our Savior did institute no *Monarchy* in the Church, in one single person, or in *Peter*: neither can it be affirmed, That this enumeration of Church-Officers, ordained by Christ, is not full, or is not perfect; as if the Apostle had omitted some Church-Officers, ordained by Christ: because it appears by *verse* 12, 13, & 14. *That no more were necessarie for the building up of the Church, or performing any dutyneccessar for the Churches instruction*: viz. *for the repairing of the Saints, for the work of the Ministrie, and for the edification of the bodie of Christ*, verse 12. *Till we all meet together (in the unitie of faith, and that acknowledging of the Son of God) unto a perfect man, and unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ*, verse 13. *That we henceforth be no more children, wavering, and carried about with every wind of doctrine*, &c.

By those words of the Apostle it appears, that no more Church Rulers are neceßar either for the *founding of the Church*: or *confirming it after it is built*, or defending it when it is *confirmed* from onsets of the Devil, or his instruments: and since *no visible Monarch of the Church* is mentioned by the Apostle, it is evident, *that there was no such Monarch ordained by Christ*.

Bellarmin answers two wayes. One way is, that the Apostle in those words, *is not delineating the Hierarchy of the Church*: but only *enumerating divers gifts of some of the Church*, and 1 *Corinthians* 12. *he adds the gift of tongues*.

But it is replyed, It cannot be denyed, but the Apostle is *enumerating diversity of gifts*; since *verse* 7. He expreßly affirms so much, but it is to be added, *that he enumerats those gifts, as they are in Officers of the Church only*: whence appears the dißimilitude of this place from 1 *Corinth.* 12. In which gifts are enumerated, which are not peculiar to *Church Rulers, but are also found in laiks*: Such as *gifts of healing, and*

tongues, &c. That this is the Apostles meaning, appears by two reasons. First he enumerats none, *verse* 11. *Who hath no degree of ruling in the Church* The second is, because *ver.* 12. 13, 14 He dotn not enumerat any utility redounding to the Church, which is not wrought by the Ministry, *ver.* 11. *He enumerats the Ministers of the Church, ver.* 12. 13, & 14. *He enumerats the ends wherefore these Ministers were ordained:* All which ends, *Oecumenius* comprehends under one, that is, saith he, *Those degrees of Ministers enumerated, verse* 12. *were for that end ordained, that they might minister unto the Church*, as appears, *ver.* 12, 13, & 14.

It is to be observed, that the Apostle enumerats here all Church Officers. both *extraordinar* and *ordinar.* The *extraordinar* are those *who were ordained only to continue for a time:* Such as *Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets. Ordinar*, are those *ordained to be of perpetual standing in the Church:* as *Doctors*, and *Pastors.* And since in all those Orders of Church Ministers there are many, and not one only in each degree: it is evident, that one *Oecumenick Bishop*, or a *visible head of the Church*, is not comprehended under any of those *Ministers.*

Bellarmin puzled with this answers another way. He grants, *that the enumeration of Church Ministers here is perfect: but he denyes that an Oecumenick Bishop hath no place in that enumeration: because*, saith he, *All the hierarchy of the Church, and consequently an Oecumenick Bishop, is confusedly represented under the name of Pastors and Doctors:* But finding that *Pastors* and *Doctors* were only inferior Orders, below, *Apostles, Prophets* and *Evangelists.* He passeth from this, and affirms next, That an *Oecumenick Bishop* is comprehended under *Apostles:* because, not only here, but also 1 *Corinth* 12. *Apostles* are put in the first place: and therefore the chief Ecclesiastick Power was given to all the *Apostles*: but to *Peter*, as *ordinar Pastor*: and therefore to have a *Successor* in it, to the other

other Apostles, as *extraordinar* and *Delegats to Peter*: and therefore none should succeed them.

But it is answered, we prolixly disputed this distinction of *Bellarmins* to be groundless, contradictory and inconsistent with it self, *cap. 6.* It is needless to repeat what we said there in this place. It is sufficient here, that never any ancient or Modern Interpreter before the times of the *Jesuits*, did so much as dream, that an Oecumenick Bishop was comprehended by the Apostle, *Ephes.* 4. 11. Which could be made out by an Induction of all the Commentaries, of ancient and Modern Writers upon that place. By which it appears, that all those testimonies by which those *Jesuits* prove the Supremacy of *Peter*, (and consequently the verity of the *Roman Faith*,) are either in Scripture or Fathers, depraved by new devised Glosses unknown to the Ancients: and also their answers, are of the same stuff, by which they elude passages of Scripture and Antiquity, destroying the Monarchy of the Bishop of *Rome*, and in it the whole edifice of the Roman Church. Both their offensive and defensive arms, are but devised of late, since the tyranny of the Bishop of *Rome* was established.

That any may see, that this Glos of *Bellarmins*, is a fiction of his own devising, we will prove by three Arguments, of three several Interpreters. By which it will appear, what was the opinion of the Church, concerning the meaning of this passage, *Ephes* 4. 11. since the times of the Apostles unto those dayes?

The first Interval is of the Primitive Church, before the Council of *Nice*, what was the opinion of that Church in that Interval? appears by the testimony of the ancient Author (*by some believed to be Dionysius Areopagita, the disciple of Paul*) his words, *epistle* 8. are those: *Tu ergo cupiditati, iracundiæ, rationi modum statue pro dignitate: tibi verò divini Ministri: hîs Sacerdotes: Pontifices Sacerdotibus: Pontificibus Apo-*

stoli, Apostolorúmque successores. Quod si quis etiam in istis ab officio discedat, à sanctis qui sunt ejusdem ordinis corrigetur: atque ita non insultabit ordo in ordinem: sed unusquisque in suo ordine, ac Ministerio premanebit. In which words ye have two things. The first is, *That the chief place in the Hierarchy, in the times of the Apostles*, was held not by one, but by many, *viz.* by all the Apostles alike: neither makes he mention of *Peter, his having that chief power, as ordinar Pastor, and of the other Apostles, as having it as Delegats to Peter*: which will be further confirmed by the second thing observable in these words, which is this: After the Apostles were removed, the chief place in the *Hierarchy* consisted also not in one person, but in many alike, *viz.* in *Bishops*, who succeeded to the Apostles in the first place of the *Hierarchie*: which also he expresly affirms to be of *equal Order and Jurisdiction: many and not one having Jurisdiction over all, as a visible head*: which quite destroyes the Gloss of *Bellarmin*, for if others succeeding to the other Apostles, were in the first place of the *Hierarchie* (which this Author flatly affirms) it is false which *Bellarmin* affirms, that all the Apostles had the chief power, *only during their own time*, not *communicable to their Successors*. And likewise, if those successors of the other Apostles, were in the first place of the *Hierarchy*, equally and alike, (as this Author also affirms) It is false, which *Bellarmin* affirms, *That the Successors of* Peter *the Apostle, had the chief authority in their single persons, as visible Monarchs of the Church.* It may be proved by the Glosses of *Maximus*, and others, that this *Dionysius* was not the Disciple of the Apostle *Paul*, mentioned in the *Acts*, because, he seems *to make mention of the Metropolitants, above bishops.* But it shal be proved, *lib.* 2. by unanswerable testimonies, *That there was no Office above that of a Bishop in the Church, before the latter end of the third age.* However, albeit he be not the Disciple of *Paul*, (as some affirm he is) yet he is an ancient Author

Author, and delineats, *the Hierarchie of the Church, not to have been monarchical in his days.*

The ſecond teſtimony, is of *Ambroſius*, who l'ved in that interval between the Council of *Nice*, and *anno* 604. at which time *Bonifacius third*, was made (firſt of all the Biſhops of *Rome*) *univerſal Biſhop* by an Edict of the Emperor *Phocas*. The words of *Ambroſius* are, *Apoſtoli ſunt Epiſcopi, nam in Epiſcopo omnes ordines ſunt, quia primus ſacerdos eſt, hoc eſt, Princeps Sacerdotum, & Propheta & Evangeliſta, & ad cætera adimplenda officia Eccleſiæ in Miniſterio fidelium.* In which words he is ſhewing, what Church-Rulers in his own time were anſwerable to, or repreſented theſe mentioned by *Paul Ephe.* 4.11. And he affirms, That Biſhops ſucceeded to the Apoſtles, in the firſt place of the *Hierarchie* (*Apoſtoli ſunt Epiſcopi*, ſaith he,) in which words he expreſly affirms, That the chief place in the *Hierarchie* in his own time, (which was the latter end of the 4. Age) was in *many*, and not in *one, viz.* in *Biſhops* who anſwered to the *Apoſtles*: And conſequently, he contradicts this gloſs of *Bellarmin*, who affirms that the *Succeſſors of Peter* (and not of the other Apoſtles) *only ſucceeded in the firſt place of Hierarchie, as Monarchs of the Church.* One *Tenebrio* or an other (whoſe name I have forgot, and alſo where I read it) intends to prove by theſe words of *Ambroſius* an Oecumenick Biſhop, becauſe *Ambroſius* makes mention of theſe words, of *Primus Sacerdos*, and *Princeps Sacerdotum, that is of firſt Prieſt and Prince of Prieſts.* But any (if not altogether ſtupid, or elſe intending to deceive) may perceive, that it is far from the meaning of *Ambroſius*, his words are, *Biſhops ſucceed to the Apoſtles, or anſwer to the Apoſtles (mentioned by* Paul, Epheſ. 4. 11 *) becauſe a Biſhop is firſt Prieſt and Prince of Prieſts*: by which it appears, that he is comparing *Biſhops with inferior Prieſts or Presbyters*, and not *Biſhops* with *Biſhops*. Which is further confirmed, becauſe

cause not only *Hieronymus* (contemporarie with *Ambrosius*) and other Fathers, but also *Ambrosius* himself, calls all Bishops, *Summos Sacerdotis, or chief Priest, and of alike Jurisdiction*: So *Anacletus, epist. 2. Tertullianus, de Baptism. cap. 17. Hieronymus, contra Luciferianos, and in his Epistle to Evagrius, Gaudentius, in tractu de Prim. die sua ordinat: Eusebius, Emisenus, in Homil. Augustinus, epist, 36. which is of Paulinus, to Romanianus, Ambrosius himself, lib. 3. cap. 1. de Sacramentis, and also epist. 5. & 34.* Other innumerable testimonies could be produced, proving all Bishops alike, are *Summi Pontifices*, or *Sacerdotes*: and consequently, that the first place of the *Hierarchie* is in many alike, and not in one *single person*, as in the Bishop of *Rome* or successor of *Peter*.

The third testimony is of *Anselmus*, who lived in the 11. age. who explaining what Church-Rulers were answerable to these mentioned by *Paul, Ephes*, 4. 11? In which he numbers the Apostle *Petr, Andrew, &c.* To which now-adays, saith he, *Answers Primats, and Patriarchs, or Arch-Bishops*, which quite destroys the gloss of *Bellarmin*, since he makes *many in the first place of the Hierarchie, and doth not dream, that the other Apostles were delegats to* Peter, *and had the first place in the Hierarchie, for that reason not communicable to their successors.* And thus we have proved, that the first place of the Hierarchie, *Jur. divino*, was not in one single person, which we have demonstrated by Scripture and Antiquity: And consequently, that *Peter* was not ordained by our Savior Monarch of the Church, which was our third argument. These of the Church of *Rome* answers the testimonies of these Fathers, calling; *All Bishops alike, or all Bishops High-Priests*, by distinguishing equality in that of *Order*, and that of *Jurisdiction*. In the first sense, they grant all Bishops are alike, but not in the last. We proved before, and shal prove hereafter, that distinction is frivolous, for the present it will be sufficient to

to refute that distinction of *Order* and *Jurisdiction*, by the testimony of an Author in great esteem, in the Church of *Rome*, and believed by them to be the Disciple of the Apostle *Paul*: *viz. Dionysius, Arcopagita*, whom we now mentioned, *epist.* 8. hath these words, *If any do amiss, he is to be censured by the Priests: If the Priest go astray he is to be ordered by the Bishop: If the Bishop debord, he should be judged by those who succeeded to the Apostles: but if those debord, they ought be judged by those of the same Order.* Observe, he puts many in the same order of alike Jurisdiction. In the first place of the Hierarchie which quite destroys that distinction of *Order* and *Jurisdiction*.

CHAP. XIV.

Of Luke 22. 25. *Compared with* Matthew 20. 25, 26. *And* Matthew 18. *And* Luke *and* Mark 9.

HItherto hath been disputed the institution of *Peters* supremacy, *pro* and *contra*, it hath been defended by these three famous passages of Scripture, *Matthew* 16. 18. *Matthew* 16. 19. and *John* 21. 15. 16, 17. It hath been brangled by other three, *Peter* 1. 5. 3. *Ephes.* 1. 22. and from *Ephes.* 4. 11. Before we proceed to dispute the supremacy of *Peter*, by his cariage: We will first explain a passage of Scripture claimed by both: that is, the *Romanists* by it endeavor to establish the *supremacy of Peter* The *Protestants* by the same place endeavor to *overthrow it*, the place is, *Luke* 22. 24, 25, 26. where after Supper, a strife arose among the Disciples who should be greatest? Verse 24 Our Savior answers, *That the Kings of the Gentiles rule over them, and for that reason, are called bountiful. verse* 25 *But*, saith he, *Ye shal not be so, but let the greatest among you, be as the least, and the chiefest, as he that serveth. Verse* 26.

Let

Let us examine: First, how the one side endeavor to assault the supremacy of *Peter*, by these words? In the next place, shal be disputed, how the other side by the same words, assert it? The one or other side, must of necessity prove the Sophister, let us examine which? And the Reader may judge which side hath the better.

The *Protestants* urge this place, against the supremacy of *Peter*, in the same manner, as they did that passage of 1. *Peter* 5. 3. disputed and vindicated before *cap.* 11. *viz. ruling* or *domination* is forbidden in the Church, in this place, *Luke* 22. 25. which cannot consist with an *Oecumenick Bishop*, which our Adversaries grant to have the right of *domination* in the Church.

Bellarmin and *Sanderus* answer in this place, *Tyrannical domination is only forbidden, and not all domination*; their reason is, because, *domination and ruling like that of the Kings of the Gentiles, is only forbidden, and not all domination.*

But it is replyed, That this answer is grounded upon two false suppositions: The first is, *That all domination of the Kings of the Gentiles is tyrannical.* The second is, that these words, verse 26. *But ye shal not be so*, have relation to the *way of domination*, and not to *domination it self.* The first supposition is false: As is proved thus.

First, It is notoriously false, *That all domination of the Kings of the Gentiles is tyrannical*; not only, because it is affirmed in several places of Scripture, *That Kings rule by GOD, and all powers are of GOD.* But also, because the Scripture commands obedience to be given unto them, for that reason: and also, *Injoyns all to pray to them*: but it is absurd, to affirm, *That tyrannical government is by GODS ordination*, or that, *The Word of GOD commands obedience unto it, or injoyns all to pray for it.*

They

They answer, It is true indeed, that all the ruling of the Kings of the Gentiles is not tyrannical. To affirm so, it fights against history, and experience; but in this place, our Savior forbids his Apostles, *To imitate the Kings of the Gentiles, when they exercise Dominion unlawfully.*

But it is replyed, This is their second false supposition, *viz.* that these words, verse 26. *But ye shal not be so*, are relative to the way of *domination*, and not to *domination it self*. Whereas these words, are referred *not to the way of domination, or tyrannical domination*: but *dominattion simply is forbidden in the Church*, which is proved by these following reasons.

The first is, That domination is forbidden, for which the Disciples did contend, or, *Who should be greatest in it?* But it is against all sense to affirm, *That they contended who should be the greatest Tyrants?* By which it is evident, that not only *tyrannical domination*, but all sort of *domination* is forbidden.

Secondly, That is forbidden, which is opposit unto *Ministry*, but all *domination* is opposit to *Ministry*, as appears by *Matthew* 20. 28. and 26. In which place the same contention, or such an other contention, among the Disciples is related; and for the same reasons, *domination is forbidden.*

Thirdly, *Luke* 22. 25. These who rule among the *Gentils*, by reason of their *domination*, are called *bountiful*. Whereby it is evident that our Savior, *forbids domination simply*: for none are called *bountiful*, by reason of *tyrannical domination.*

Fourthly, These words, *Ye shal not be so*, or, *ye shal not do so*, or, *not so ye*, according to the constant phrase of Scripture, *denotat an inhibition of a thing altogether, and not of it in such and such a way.* So *Gen.* 4. *Cain* affirms, *And he who meets me, shal kill me*: the LORD answers, *Non sic, not so*: the meaning is, *he shal not be killed at all*: And not that he shal not be killed *after such and such a manner.* So *Nehem.* 5. 15. *Ne-*

hemia complains, *That some of the former Governors had extorted the people, and taken bread, and wine, and money from them; and made their servants rule over them.* He adds, *I did not so*, his meaning is, *That he did not only not take bread, and wine, and money from them, or oppressed them in such a manner: but that he did not oppress them at all.* Likewise, *Psalm* 1 3. it is said, *That the righteous man shal be like a tree bringing forth fruit seasonably, &c.* Verse 4. it is affirmed, *The wicked are not so*, the meaning is, not only, *that the wicked shal not prosper in that manner only: but that they shal not prosper at all.* Likewise, *Matthew* 19. when the Pharisees objected to Christ, that *Moses did command to give a bill of divorce, that a man should put away his wife upon every slight occasion.* Our Savior answers, verse 8. *From the beginning it was not so.* In which words, the meaning of our Savior is, *That divorces without just reason, should not be given at all, and not that divorces without reason may be given, in some cases, although not in other.* And thus we have proved, that in *Luke* 22. 25. not only *tyrannical domination*, but all *domination* is forbidden in the Church. And consequently, the *supremacy of Peter is also there forbidden: since a visible head of the Church cannot be without domination.* And whereas our Adversaries affirm, that only *tyrannical domination* is forbidden: Although it were so, this place quite militats against an *Oecumenick Bishop*; because we did demonstrate *cap* 11. by six unanswerable particulars or arguments, that the *domination of the Bishop of Rome: was not only tyrannical, but also blasphemous.*

We have hitherto disputed against the *supremacy of Peter*, from this place, *Luke* 22. 25. Now let us examine, how from the same place, *Bellarmin* and *Sanderus* dispute for it? Their Sophistry is admirable, and therefore it will not be unpleasing to examine it. Their first sophistry consists in this, *viz.* being

ing preſſed with paralell places to this, that nothing can be gathered from thoſe contentions of the Apoſtles, *for the ſupremacy of Peter, but rather much againſt it.* *Sanderus* as a ground of his future ſophiſtry, makes a diſtinction between this place, and theſe other *paralell places*, which is this. The Apoſtles, ſaith he, Contended four ſeveral times for *dominion*. The firſt is, after the transfiguration of Chriſt in the mountain, *Mark.* 9. 34. and *Luke* 9.46. The ſecond, after the petition of the ſons of *Zebedeus*, or of their Mother, *Matthew* 20. verſe 20. and *Mark.* 10. 35. The third time was, when the Tribute was payed, *Matthew.* 18. 1. The laſt time was, after the Supper, *Luke* 22. The firſt three times, *Sanderus* grants that nothing can be gathered, for the *ſupremacy of Peter*: becauſe in theſe places, only *prophane domination is forbidden.* But in the laſt place, *Luke* 22. not only *prophane domination* is forbidden: but alſo, *Lawful domination, or the ſupremacy of Peter is generally and confuſedly, if not ordained, at leaſt ſignified, or intimated.* If ye ask at *Sanderus*, What more in this laſt place, then in the three firſt, ſince in all the four places, the thing for which the Apoſtles ſtrove, was the ſame: and the anſwer of Chriſt unto them was the ſame? He anſwers you, ſeveral ways, but before we examine his anſwers, we will firſt ſhow how he is miſtaken, in affirming the Diſciples *ſtrove four times for dominion*. Albeit it be no great matter how many times they ſtrove? Yet, it is certain, that they did not ſtrive four times, but only two, or at the moſt three times. Firſt, becauſe the Evangeliſts doth not mention it oftner then two times, as *Matth. cap.* 18. & 20. *Mark. cap.* 9. 10. *Luk. cap.* 9. 22. Secondly, it is certain that *Matthew* 18. *Mark.* 9. and *Luk.* 9. mentions the ſame *contention* or *hiſtory*, as appears, not only by the place *Capernaum* mentioned, *Mark.* 9. and the paying of the *Tribute*, was made in the ſame place, *Matthew* 17. *After which the contention aroſe*, *Matthew* 18. But alſo, by

the circumstance of the *little Child*, mentioned *Luk.* 9. 47. and *Mark* 9. 36. *Hieronymus* also, and *Euthymius*, affirm, That the same story is related, *Matthew* 18. and *Mark* and *Luk.* 9. The second contention is mentioned, *Matthew* 20. *Mark* 10. & *Luk.* 22. It is very probable, that the same history is related also in those three places; because the answer of Christ is the same in them all: but *Euthymius* makes *Luke* 22. a different contention from *Matthew* 20. and *Mark* 10. because in *Luk.* 22. no mention is made of *the petition of the Sons of Zebedeus, or their Mother*, as *Mark* 10. and *Matthew* 20. So at the most, the Apostles strove only three times for *dominion*, if not two times only. But let it be granted to *Sanderus*, that they *strove four times*: We ask him, what more can be gathered for the *supremacy of Peter*, from *Luk.* 22. then from the other three places? since in all four they strove for the same thing, *viz. dominion.* And our Savior dissuades them from such striving, for the same reasons, in the first three places, (or at least in some of them) for which he dissuades them, *Luk.* 22.

Sanderus answers, and also *Bellarmin*: First, that *Luk.* 22. our Savior affirms, *Let the greatest among you be as the least*; but *Matthew* 20. 26. he only affirmeth, *Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your servant.* The difference is, *Greatest*, *Luk.* 22 imports a superiority, which *Great*, *Matthew* 20. doth not import.

But it is answered, They bable, for it appears expressly by the words, that the meaning of our Savior in both places is the same. As for the objection, it is of no moment, *for great among you, and greatest among you*, is the same thing: *Great among you* is an *Hebraism*, for the superlative of the *Latins* and *Grecians*, which superlative, the *Oriental tongues have not*; and so *great* and *greatest* are the same thing, *Matthew* and *Mark* retain the *Hebraism*, but *Luke* expresseth it in the comparative degree μείζων, whereas *Matthew* and *Mark* have μέγας, that

that is, what *Matthew* and *Mark* calls *great* in the *poſitive degree*, *Luke* calls *more great*, in the *comparative degree*: whereas the expreſſions of both are equivalent to μεγιστος, *greateſt among you*, *in the ſuperlative degree*. For its certain, at leaſt, that the meaning of *great* in *Matthew* and *Mark*, and of *greateſt* in *Luke* 22. is the ſame: becauſe the *Syrian* Interpreter, renders them both by one word. Likewiſe, that *great* in *Matthew* and *Mark*, is the ſame with *greateſt* in *Luke*, appears, becauſe *great* in *Matthew* and *Mark* is *comparative*, for immediatly, after theſe words follow, *He who ſhould be firſt among you*. Whereby it is evident, that *great* is all one with *greateſt*. Since firſt is *relative* to *among you*; & conſequently all one, with μειζων.

Sanderus urgeth ſecondly, that in *Matthew* and *Mark*, our Savior affirms, *He who will be great among you*, but in *Luke*, *He who is greateſt among you*, whereby it is evident, that one already is *greateſt* among them. Where he obſerves a twofold difference. Firſt, by reaſon of the *Greek* Article ὁ, which ever denotats a *ſingle perſon*: Secondly, by reaſon of the ſubſtantive verb. ἐστι, *eſt*, *is*, which denotats one who now is *greateſt* among you.

But it is anſwered, to omit the ſubſtantive verb, is not mentioned in *Luke* at all, who affirms only ὁ μειζων, and not ὁ ἐστι μειζων: (*Sanderus* and *Bellarmin* argue from the *Latin* Verſion) both the articles ὁ, and the ſubſtantive verb ἐστι, are mentioned, *Luk* 9. ὁ μικροτερος ὑπαρχων. But *Sanderus* grants one is not made leaſt in that place.

Bellarmin urgeth another difference, as *Luk* 22. ὁ ἡγουμενος, which word ſignifieth a *Prince* or *Captain*, *a ſingle perſon commanding over many*: But is anſwered, Nothing can be gathered from that word, becauſe, *Acts* 15. 22. and *Heb.* 13. 16. 17. many ἡγουμενοι, *leaders* are not only ſaid to be in the *Church*, but alſo in the ſame *Particular Church*.

Sanderus yet inſtances that, *Matthew* 20. 16. It is affirmed

med, *He who would be great among you, let him be your servant.* But *Luk.* 22. 26. *He who is greatest among you, let him be as he that serveth.* He imagins some great mystery between these two expressions, *let him be a servant*, and *let him be as a servant*: By which subtilty of his, any may see what poor shifts they make to prove the *Supremacy of Peter*, and consequently *the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome*, and also *the Religion of the Modern Church of Rome*: For none but a brazen faced Sophister, can observe any difference in those words of our Savior, *Matthew* 20. *Let him be a servant*, and *Luk* 22. *Let him be as a servant*: neither of the Phrases are proper, as if our Savior had said in either place, *Let him be properly a servant*, in both places the speech is *Metaphorical*, which Masters of Rethorick describe, to be a *Similitude contracted to one word*, or, *Metaphora est ad unum verbum contracta similitudo*, the difference between a *metaphor*, and *a similitude* is, that a *metaphor* contracts the *similitude to one word*, *v. g.* when we call a subtile witty man *like a Fox*: it is a *similitude* formally expressed: but when we call him *a Fox*, it is a *metaphor*: and so it may be concluded, that both those speeches may be called as well *similituds*, as *metaphors*. That is, a *similitude* is a *metaphor* inlarged by the particles *as*, or *like*. And a *metaphor* is a *similitude* contracted, taking away those particles *as*: when we say in the *similitude*, a subtile man is like a *Fox*: we say in the *metaphor*, *He is a Fox*. The meaning is the same in both expressions: now to apply, *Let him serve, or be a servant, Matthew* 20. is the *metaphor* or the *similitude* contracted: but in *Luke* 22. *Let him be as a servant*, is the *similitude* or *metaphor* inlarged, and the meaning in both is one, *viz. The only way to be great in the Kingdom of Heaven, is to carry themselves humbly and like servants*: And therefore, *Sanderus* is endeavoring to make ropes in the sand, seeking any mystical difference between, *Let him be a servant*, *Matthew* 20. and *let him be as a servant*, *Luke* 22.

Sanderus

Sanderus urgeth still, that *Luke* 22. one must be greatest already amongst them, since our Savior instructs him, how to carry himself in that station, *viz. as a servant.*

But it is answered, This objection is of like stuff with the former, for if it were of any force, it would conclude that one also were *least* among them already: that is below all the rest; which *Sanderus* will not readily grant: because, *Luke*, *It is said, He that is least among you, shal be great, cap.* 9. 48. The truth is, the speech of our Savior in both these places is indefinit, not mentioning any one in particular, either as *greatest* or *least*. The true meaning of his words are, He who *is most submissive* among you, be who he will, one or other? deserves the greatest respect, and for that reason will be greatest in the sight of God, or in the Kingdom of heaven.

In the last place, *Bellarmin*, and *Sanderus* both set on with an admirable Sophism, they differ in words, yet object the same in substance. *Sanderus* propones it thus.

Immediatly after our Savior had uttred these words, *Let him who is greatest, be as a Servant.* He proposeth an example of himself to be followed: by that person who is greatest, in these words, *For I my self am as a servant in the mids of you*; that is, saith *Sanderus*, Since *I who am greatest of you all, and primary head of the Church, carrieth my self like a Servant, he who is head of the Church under me, and greatest among you, should follow my example*: other-wise, saith he, The words of our Savior would not cohere with the words going before: which they do by reason of the illative particle. *For*, verse 27.

But it is answered, We have proved already, that the speech of our Savior was directed to them all: and therefore it coheres well enough when he proposeth his own example as a reason of his former exhortation to them. His meaning is, I who am greatest among you, am as a Servant in the mids of you; And therefore, any who would be really above the rest in esteem

esteem of God, let him follow my example, by carrying himself humbly.

Bellarmin proposeth this Argument in another manner, and in effect surpasseth *Sanderus* both in Sophistry and Impudence. He reasons thus, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 9. *De Pont. Rom.* Christ saith he, affirms, That he was a Servant in the midst of them, *Luke* 22. But *John* 13. he affirms, The Disciples spake truth, when they called him *Lord and Master.* The scope of our Savior in these words then, *Luke* 22. is to ordain one greatest amongst them, or to exhort him, who is ordained already greatest to follow his example, both in greatness and humility: as if he had said, My will is, that one of you should be head over the rest as my Vicar, and that he shal carry himself humbly, as I do, *viz.* as a Servant to the rest.

But it is answered, That *Bellarmin* sophisticats two wayes. First, he supposns falsly, that this exhortation of our Savior, and the reason of it from his own example was directed to one in particular: whereas it is directed to all the Apostles, and therefore, his first sophistry is in the persons exhorted.

His second sophistry is in the thing exhorted, *viz.* to follow his own example. *Bellarmin* mentions two things in which they are injoyned to follow the example of Christ. First, his greatness. Secondly, his humble carriage in the opinion of *Bellarmin.* Our Savior exhorts them to follow his example in both, to prove which he brings in that passage of *John* 13. impertinently, having nothing to do with this passage, *Luke* 22. By which it appears, that our Savior exhorts them only to humility, or to follow the example of his humility, and not of his greatness, as is evident by the words uttered by him, as his reason, *For, I am as a servant in the mids of you.* The Sophism of *Bellarmin* redacted to a form is this, I am head of you all, and carrieth my self humbly, follow my example: *Ergo* saith *Bellarmin*, He exhorts one to be head of the rest, as himself

himſelf was; and to carry himſelf humbly as himſelf did, whereas our Savior deſires them all indefinitly (not one in particular) to follow his example in humble carriage: not in *Domination*, which he expreſly forbids, *verſe* 26.

That this gloſs of *Bellarmins* is a new deviſed fiction amongſt the reſt, to uphold the Supremacy of *Peter* againſt all Antiquity, we could further prove by many Fathers. On theſe words we will mention one teſtimony; by which it appears, that in the opinion of Antiquity, the words of our Savior were ſpoken indefinitly to all, and not to one in particular. Secondly, that he exhorts them only to follow his example, in humble carriage, and not in *Domination*. This paſſage is of *Theophylactus*, upon thoſe words, *Cum igitur ego, qui ab angelica & rationali natura adorer, in medio veſtri miniſtro, quo pacto vos æquum eſt, magnificè de vobis ſentire, & Primatum ambire?* By which words it appears, Firſt, that his ſpeech is directed to them all. Secondly, that he exhorts them only to follow his example in humility: we could alſo inſtance other teſtimonies, but it is needleſs.

Hitherto, in this Book we have diſputed the Supremacy of *Peter, pro* and *contra, viz.* we have examined all what is alledged of any moment, either for the inſtitution, or againſt the inſtitution of *Peter* in that function of *Oecumenick Biſhop*. Both the one ſide, and the other bring ſeveral Arguments, which we have omitted; but they are of no moment in compariſon of thoſe we have examined, being in effect nothing elſe but Corrolaries of the former, or elſe ſome places of Scripture miſ-interpreted, ſophiſticated, & wreſted by the late *Jeſuits* againſt the ſtream of antiquity, & *Analogy* of Scripture it ſelf. Neither are they taken for the moſt part from the Inſtitution of *Peter* (as the former) but from his carriage and Prerogatives (as they call them.) And leſt any ſhould think, that we omitted them, as if they were unanſwerable, we will in thoſe following

Chapters anatomize all of them which are not meerly ridiculous.

CHAP. XV.

Of the Prerogatives of Peter *in general.*

Bellarmin, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 17. *De Pont. Rom.* having disputed the Institution of *Peter*, or the promise of it, from *Mat.* 16. 18, 19. and *John* 21. 15, 16, 17. that is, from the *Rock*, from the *Keyes*, and from the *feeding of the sheep of Christ*; promiseth next to prove it by *Prerogatives*, which is a very uncertain way of probation, except he explain it, what Prerogatives were? They must of necessity, belong either to the person of *Peter*, or to the function of Oecumenick Bishop: if they belong only to his person, they are nothing to the purpose. Since many have personal Prerogatives, as well as *Peter*, the Prerogatives of *Paul* are nothing inferior to those of *Peter*: And since they do not conclude *Paul* to be *Oecumenick Bishop*, no more do these Prerogatives of *Peter* conclude him to be *Oecumenick Bishop*. What more glorious Prerogatives can any have then those of *Paul*? He was brought up in all sorts of learning, and of a *Persecutor* was miraculously converted to Christ, *Act.* 9 only called a chosen vessel, *ibid.* To him only Christ appeared after his *ascension*, *ibid.* Rapt up to the third Heaven, 2 *Cor.* 12. labored more then all the other Apostles, 1 *Cor.* 15. Rebuked *Peter* as a dissembler in his face, *Gal.* 2. gave a man over to Sathan, 1 *Cor.* 5. was first sent by the Spirit to preach unto the *Gentiles*, *Acts* 13. healed the sick only with his handkerchief, *Acts* 19. Struck *Elimas* with blindness, *ibid.* converted the *Proconsul*, *ibid*: while he was yet alive himself, his *Epistles* were cited as *Canonick Scripture*, and that by *Peter* himself: 2 *Peter* 3. The name of Christians had its first original from the Preaching of *Paul*. So *Chrysostomus*, as he is cited

cited by *Photius Bibliothec. cap.* 270. In a word, *Chryſoſtomus* himſelf, *Homily* 77. *de pœnitent.* &c. magnifieth ſo thoſe Prerogatives of *Paul*, as if no mortal man were capable of greater: and ſince theſe Prerogatives of *Paul* do not conclude him *Oecumick Biſhop*; how can thoſe Prerogatives of *Peter* conclude him to be ſo? And leſt any ſhould think that the reaſon is, becauſe the Prerogatives of *Peter* were greater then theſe of *Paul*: hear *Ambroſius*, or if ye pleaſe *Maximus*, *Sermon* 66. who having declaimed on the Prerogatives of *Peter*, and *Paul*, concludes in thoſe words, *Ergo, beati* Petrus *&* Paulus, *eminent inter univerſos Apoſtolos, & peculiari quadam prærogativa præcellunt, verum inter ipſos, quis cui proponatur incertum eſt?* The ſum of which is, *That the prerogatives of both are ſo great, that none can tell which of them is to be preferred,* viz. *Peter or Paul?* If this doth not ſatisfie the Reader, that the Prerogatives of *Paul* were as great, as theſe of *Peter*; let him hear *Chryſoſtom, Hom.* 66. where he affirms expreſly, That none doubted of this, *viz.* that none of the Apoſtles went before *Paul*: and alſo on *Galat.* 2. he affirms, *Paulus non egebat voce Petri, nec eo opus habebat: ſed honore par erat illi; nihil hic dicam amplius.* By theſe laſt words, it is evident to any intelligent Reader, that in his opinion, *Paul* was to be preferred to *Peter*.

We have ſpoken already of perſonal Prerogatives, that they can be no argument to prove the *Supremacy of* Peter, ſince in the opinionof the Ancients, the Prerogatives of *Paul* were equal to thoſe of *Peter*, as expreſly is affirmed by them: and alſo Superior to thoſe of *Peter*, as may be gathered, not obſcurely from their words: albeit out of modeſty they affirm it not expreſly. Prerogatives then concluding *Peter* to be *Oecumenick Biſhop*, muſt of neceſſity be *prerogatives inſeparable from that function.* And in that caſe, the pretended ſucceſſors of *Peter*, or the Biſhops of *Rome* muſt alſo have thoſe Prerogatives: that they have, none but a mad man will affirm; ſince

among these Prerogatives are numbred *walking upon the water*, and such like, which would puzle the *Bishops* of *Rome* now to do. In a word, among all those prerogatives of *Peter*, there is not one that concludes him more *Oecumenick Bishop*, then they do him *Emperor* of *Rome*, which none but a Sophister will deny. There is not one of them which is not either notoriously false, or notoriously impertinent, or else refuted already. For ye must understand amongst the Prerogatives of *Peter*, they not only reckon up what they have said already, as, *Tu es Petrus, tibi dabo claves, pasce oves meas*: but also those very things which they dispute, after they have disputed his Prerogatives, tempting the Readers patience with repetitions of the same things. Any who will take the pains to anatomize those Volumns of Controversies set forth by *Bellarmin*, they will find them to be nothing else, but a *Rible Rable of contradictory Sophistry, impertinent Rhetorications, and oratorial digressions, tedious repetitions* of the same things *ad nauseam usque, wrested, mutilated, falsly interpreted, and forged Testimonies of the Ancients, to deceive his Reader, confirm ignorants in the Romish Idolatry*; thinking to deterr his learned Adversaries from discovering his weakness by his prolixity. In which Artifices, *Baronius* is nothing inferior to him, being the most shameless corrupter of Antiquity, which the world hath hitherto produced: as appears by those exercitations of *Causabon*, & others upon him. One thing is to be observed in him, *Bellarmin*, *Petavius*, and some others; that when they are most destitute of reason, they brag most: and when they cannot answer an Argument in reason, they fall a scolding; taxing learned men, yea, of their own side, of *ignorance*, *madness*, and *heresie*, for refusing to acknowledge *fantastick fictions*, devised by themselves, as *irrefragable principles*.

Their Sophistry is very great in this following disput of the Prerogatives of *Peter*: in which *Bellarmin*, and *Baronius* clash

claſh together in things of greateſt importance. The truth is, there is not any thing worth the anſwering in all this prolix diſput of *prerogatives*; Nevertheleſs, leſt any ſhould think I omitted their arguments, becauſe they are unanſwerable, I will trace the method of *Bellarmin*, anſwering his arguments, ſo that any indifferent man may be convinced of the truth. And if any be not ſatisfied, let him read *Chamier*, *Whitaker*, and others, who proſecute that diſpute to the full. The *Papiſh* Authors enumerate not the *prerogatives* after the ſame manner: ſome reckoning fewer then others. *Bellarmin* enumerats all theſe which any of them mentions, in number 28. the firſt 20. they endeavor to prove by Scripture, the other 8. by Tradition. We will diſpute the firſt 20. in the following 16. chapter, and the other 8. chapter 17. Of which in order.

CHAP XVI.

Of the Scriptural Prerogatives of Peter.

THe *Scriptural Prerogatives* of *Peter*, as we ſaid, are *twenty*, the truth is, they are not worth the refuting: but leſt our Adverſaries brag that we omitted them, becauſe they could not be anſwered, I intreat the Reader to have patience, till I paſs through that *Augiæ Stabulum*, *viz.* that diſput of *Bellarmin*, concerning the *prerogatives* of *Peter*. Where ye ſhal find, Firſt, That though they were all true, and proved, yet thoſe fore-mentioned *prerogatives* of *Paul*, are nothing inferior to them. Secondly, It will appear that there is not one of them, but it is either *impertinent*, *and nothing to the purpoſe*; or elſe, *notoriouſly falſe*. But now have at them.

The firſt *prerogative* is, That our Savior changed the name of *Peter*, from *Simon* to *Peter*, *John* 1. *Tu es Simon filius Jona*,

tu

tu vocaberis Cephas: *Thou art Simon the son of Jonas, thou shalt be called Cephas.* But it is answered, it proves nothing: First, many had new names given them, and yet were not *Oecumenick Bishops*: Yea, other Apostles also, as *Paul*, was once called *Saul*; also the sons of *Zebedeus*, *James* and *John*, had the names of *Boanerges* given unto them.

Bellarmin instanceth many ways, vexing himself and his Reader; so do *Stapleton* & *Toletus*, but nothing to the purpose: wearying both themselves and their Readers, with extravagant phantasies, falling again upon *Tu es Petrus*, which we dispersed to the full before.

The second *prerogative* is this, When the names of the Apostles are enumerated, *Peter is still named first*, as *Matthew* 10. *Mark* 3. *Luke* 6. *Acts* 1 *Mark* 5. and other places.

But it is answered, It is notoriously false, as appears by 1. *Corinth.* 3. *and* 9. *Galat.* 2. *Mark* 16. *John* 1. In all which places, other Apostles are named before *Peter*: And although it were true, that *Peter* was ever named first, it concludes no *primacy of Jurisdiction*, but only of *order*, which may be among those of *equal authority*. As in a Colledge of Judges, the name of the eldest Judge, or President, is the first in the *Nomenclature* or *Catalogue*.

The third *prerogative* is from *Matthew* 14. 29. *That Peter only walked upon the waters with our Savior*: As also, that *John* 21. 7. *That Peter did leap in the Sea for haste to be at Christ.*

But it is answered, This is a great *prerogative* in *Peter*, indeed, shewing only the fervor of his minde, and love to Christ; But inconsequent, to prove him *Oecumenick Bishop*. Christs *appearing to Paul after his Ascension*, was a *prerogative* nothing inferior: *Peter* is no more concluded *Oecumenick Bishop*, by this *prerogative*, then the other Apostles by the miracles wrought by them,

The

The fourth *prerogative* is from *Matthew* 16. 16. *viz. That the Myſtery of the Trinity, and Incarnation of Chriſt, was firſt revealed to* Peter, *before it was revealed to any of the reſt.*

But it is anſwered, Although it were granted, as in effect many Fathers believe that it is true; it is inconſequent to prove *Peter Oecumenick Biſhop.* Secondly, it is notoriouſly falſe, and preſuppons that the *Patriarchs, Prophets, and Saints of the Old Teſtament, were ignorant of the Myſtery of the Trinity and Incarnation of Chriſt.* If they inſtance, they knew only in general, *That the Meſſias would be the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity, Incarnat, and born of a Virgin; but not in particular, that Chriſt was the Meſſias.* It is replyed that *John* the *Baptiſt*, before ever *Peter* knew Chriſt, profeſſed that *Jeſus* of *Nazareth*, in particular, *the ſuppoſed Son of Joſeph and Son* of *Mary*, was the *Son of GOD, and the Savior of the World, foretold by the Prophets. Nathanael* alſo profeſſed ſo much. It is a moſt ſimple evaſion of *Bellarmins, That theſe confeſſed Chriſt to be the Son of GOD, in that manner, as all the Saints are called Sons of GOD, or by Adoption:* ſince *John* the *Baptiſt* expreſly teſtifies that *Chriſt was the Meſſias foretold by the Prophets.* Alſo, that the ſame was revealed to *Simeon, Luke* 2. none without impudence can deny *Nathanael* alſo, *John* 1. not only calls Chriſt the *Son of GOD, but alſo the King of Iſrael:* and *Auguſtin, tract.* 7. in *John*, affirms, that the confeſſion of *Nathanael*, and that of *Peter* were the ſame.

The fifth *prerogative*, is *Matthew* 16. 18. *The gates of hell ſhal not overcome it.* It is anſwered, we ſhewed before the expoſition of this place, *viz. That the gates of hell ſhould not overcome the Church.* They alledge here a great *prerogative*, for, ſay they, the reſt of the Apoſtles had not this promiſe, *for the gates of hell prevailed againſt the Churches founded by the other Apoſtles*; ſince the Church of *Jeruſalem* founded by *James*,

(and

and also the Churches founded by the other Apostles are decayed. But it is answered. This *prerogative* is grounded upon a false supposition; *viz.* that our Savior meaned by the *Church* of *Rome*, the Church founded by *Peter*, of which he did not dream: for we shewed before, that the *Rock* upon which the Church is built, was only Christ: and that these Fathers who interpreted the *Rock* to be the *confession of Peter*, or *Peter himself*, meaned all one thing with those who interpreted the *Rock* to be Christ; as is evident in *Augustinus*, who in one place interprets the *Rock* to be Christ. In an other the *confession of Peter*. In a third, *Peter himself*. However, they intangle themselves pitifully, in expounding the *Rock* both to be *Peter*, and the *seat of Peter*: which are different things, and it shal also be proved in the last chapter of this book, that *Rome was not the seat of Peter*, more then of *Paul*. And therefore they absurdly interpret, *the Rock to be the Church of Rome*.

The sixth *prerogative*, *Matthew* 17. *Christ commanded tribute to be payed for him and* Peter: whence some Fathers gather, that the Apostles themselves knew the supremacy of *Peter*. So *Hieronymus* on *Matthew* 18. as he is cited by *Bellarmin*.

But it is answered, Although some Fathers were of that opinion, that the Apostles knew by *that tribute paying*, that *Peter* would be preferred to them all: the opinion of those Fathers is notoriously false; *for the strife of the sons of* Zebedeus *was after the tribute paying*. But they never would have demanded to be preferred to the rest, if they had known that *Peter* was preferred already: Yea, also that contention of all the Apostles for the primacy, *was after that tribute paying*. But they had been mad-men to have contended for the thing *Peter* had already. As for *Hieronymus*, *Bellarmin* cites him unfaithfully, he on *Matthew* 18. expresly affirms, *That these were in an error who collected the supremacy of Peter* That-

that tribute paying: *Bellarmin* hath an other ſhift, that the error mentioned by *Hieronymus*, conſiſted in this, *That they believed by that tribute paying, that* Peter *would be a temporal Prince or Monarch.* But it is replyed, though that fiction were granted, they are alſo in an error, who believe that the Biſhop of *Rome is a temporal monarch.* But they affirm, that *Peter* was the ſame which the *Biſhop* of *Rome* is: but that he holds himſelf as a temporal Monarch, and teacheth it *in Cathedra*, we ſhewed before, *cap* 11. However it is a very ſtrange conſequence, *Peter payed tribute*; Ergo, *he was Monarch of the Church*, ſince the Biſhops of *Rome* (as ſhall be proved, *part* 3. *lib.* 1.) refuſe to pay tribute, *Becauſe they pretend they are Monarchs of the Church.* It is notorious alſo, that all the Apoſtles, *viritim*, payed tribute as well as *Peter.*

Bellarmin and others inſtance with great *pompe*, that ſome myſtery lurks in this, that our Savior *commanded tribute to be payed for him and* Peter: viz. *That the heads of the families only payed tribute, and conſequently, that Chriſt was head of the family, and* Peter *ſecondary head under him.*

But it is replyed, That argument would conclude, that all the *Church Militant payed only tribute to their Oecumenick Biſhop*; *or that the ſaid tribute was payed for all the Church Militant*: which cannot be mentioned without laughter. However, they go on in ſophiſtry, and proves by the teſtimony of *Hieronymus, that only the heads of families payed tribute*: *Quid tum poſtea?* It doth not follow, *That the head of the* Church Militant *payed tribute for all the Members of it.* Secondly, it is impudent ſophiſtry, to pretend the authority of *Hieronymus.* His words are, *Poſt Auguſtum Cæſarem, Judæa facta eſt tributaria, & omnes cenſi capite ferebantur.* It is ſtupendious ſophiſtry (ſince no learned man can be ſo ignorant) to affirme, that *Hieronymus* in theſe words, mentions, *That heads of the families only payed tribute*: ſince it appears to

all, who are not utterly ignorant of the *Latin* tongue, that *census capite*, imports as much as *Viritim*, that is, *Every person payed tribute, or every head for himself, and not only heads of families.*

It is demanded then, What was the meaning of our Savior, in that paying of tribute for *Peter* and himself? *Chrysostomus, hom.* 59. on *Matthew*, thinks this was the reason, *Because both our Savior and* Peter *were first born.* But the holy Father is in a great mistake, for two reasons. The first is, *Because that tribute was not the tribute of the first born, (which was payed only once in a lifetime) but an annual tribute, which was payed every year.* Secondly, *Peter* was not first born, but *Andrew* his brother.

Jansenius, a Learned and Ingenuous Papist, *Concord.* 69. affirms, the reason was, *Because* Peter *and Christ was then together alone.* He is not so subtile as *Bellarmin*, to gather any supremacy of *Peter*, from those words: The truth is, both *Peter* and our Savior dwelt at *Capernaum*, as may be gathered from *Matthew* 9. 1. *Mark* 2. 1. *Luke* 4. 31. 38. And it is very like that our Savior was then in the house of *Peter*, to which he went out of the *Synagogue*, *Luke* 4. 38. and being *Peters* Guest, and Master also, payed for him; ye may see by hunting this *prerogative*, how they scrape Sophistry out of the fire, to prove the supremacy of *Peter.*

The seventh *prerogative*, is, *two miracles in fishing*, *Luke* 5. 3. and *John* 21. 6. If ye demand, what can be gathered from these miracles? They tell you, Christ taught in *Peters* ship, and *Peters* ship was the Church; and since *Peter* was head of his own ship, he was also *head of the Church.*

But it is answered, How know they that the ship was *Peters*? *Salmero* the *Jesuit* doubts he was so rich. And so that argument falls a will, except they prove that the ship was *Peters.* It is admirable to consider how *Bellarmin* plungeth himself

himſelf in Sophiſtry; diſtilling the *ſupremacy of Peter* from the lymbick of his brains by wilde allegories, that the Reader may laugh. It will not be amiſs to anatomize his Diſpute.

Firſt, He affirms, theſe two *miracles of Fiſhing*, both ſignify the *Church*: that of *Luke* 5. *the Church Militant*, becauſe it was before the Reſurrection: that of *John* 21. *the Church Triumphant*, becauſe *it was after the Reſurrection*. He adds an other reaſon, in the firſt *Fiſhing*, our Savior bids *them only make ready their nets for the fiſhing*. In the ſecond, he injoyns them, *to caſt out the net upon their right hand*. Who doubts but the Church Militant is ſignified by the firſt *Fiſhing*? Becauſe in it both good and bad are received; what ever ſide of the ſhip the net be caſt from. And who can call it in queſtion, that the *ſecond fiſhing ſignifies the Church Triumphant*? In which only the good are comprehended, ſince the Apoſtles are injoyned, *To caſt out the net on the right ſide of the ſhip*: ſtill good, but better followeth. In the firſt *fiſhing*, the nets do break, *denotating the Schiſms and Hereſies of the Church Militant*. In the ſecond, the nets did not break at all, which ſignifyeth, *The Unity of the Church Triumphant*. Learned ſubtilty follows, *In the firſt fiſhing, the number of the fiſh is not determinated which were catched*, ſignifying, or fulfilli g that paſſage of the *Pſalm*, *I ſpake and they were multiplyed without number*; which is a clear demonſtration, *That the Church Militant is repreſented by that fiſhing*. But in the ſecond *fiſhing*, the caught *fiſh* were preciſely 153. By which it is no leſs evident, that in it, *The Church Triumphant is repreſented*. Laſtly, If any obſtinat Heretick be not convinced by theſe former reaſons, that in theſe two *fiſhings*, the *Church Militant* and *Triumphant* are repreſented, they cannot but be convinced, by this following reaſon. *viz*. In the *firſt fiſhing*, *the fiſh were taken in the ſhip*, *Luke* 5. But in the ſecond, *John* 21. *The fiſh were not taken in the ſhip*, *but drawn a*

shore in the net. The first signifying „*The fluctuating of the Church Militant, receiving indifferently all.* The second, *The stability of the Church Triumphant, receiving none but the Elect.*

Upon those irrefragable principles, *Bellarmin* demonstrates the supremacy of *Peter* thus. Since, saith he, Both these *fishings* represent the Church, and *Peter* is the chief *Fisher* of them both: Who but an Heretick will deny, that *Peter is head of the Church?* And as if there were no more to prove, but that *Peter* was the *Master-Fisher*; he falls to the proving of it. First, *Our Savior seeing more ships on the shore, entred that of* Peters, *and not the rest.* Secondly, *He bade* Peter *launch out, and make ready the nets.* Thirdly, *He said to* Peter, *Fear not, after this thou shalt be a Fisher of men*; and thus way he proves *Peter* to be *Master Fisher* in the first *Fishing.* That he was also in the second he proves: First, because *Peter affirmed, he was going a fishing, and the rest said, they would go with him.* Secondly, *Peter drew the net to the land.* It is needless to spend time in refuting *has quisquilias*: any who would see *Bellarmin* and his fellows are exsibilated by *Chamier*, let him read *tom.* 1. *lib.* 11. *cap.* 17. from the beginning to *num.* 10.

The eight *prerogative* is taken from *Luke* 22. 32. *But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not: therefore when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.* If ye aske them, What *prerogative* is here? They tell you first, that these words were spoken to *Peter* immediatly after our Savior had conferred the supremacy upon him: In the former contention, verse 26. *confusedly* and *generally*, not naming him. But now, in these words, he designs in particular, *Peter to be that person whom he called greatest amongst them*, verse 26.

But it is replyed, It was proved false, *cap.* 14. that any person was ordained greatest among them, *Luke* 22. 26.

Secondly, They build on this, because *Peter* is injoyned by

by Chriſt to confirm his brethren therein. But it is anſwered, *Confirming of brethren* inferrs not an *Oecumenick Biſhop*: becauſe *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *confirmed brethren*, *Acts* 14. 22. So *Judas* and *Silas*, *Acts* 15. 32. Innumerable other particulars (but it is needleſs to mention them) might be produced. And whereas they urge, that the word *confirm* imports *authority*. It is anſwered, Sometime it doth, but not *ſupream authority*; however in this place it imports no authority at all, but only *good example*: So *Theophylactus*, *Tu enim*, Petre, *converſus bonum exemplum fies pœnitentiæ omnibus*: *nullúſque eorum qui in me credunt*, *deſperabit*, *in te reſpiciens*. Where obſerve, he makes that confirming, nothing but by good example, *he ſhal confirm his brethren*; for in theſe words, our Savior is meaning the *Apoſtacy of* Peter *in his thrice denying him*: and ſo *Theophylactus* comments upon the place, *viz.* that *Peter ſhal confirm his Brethren*, *by keeping them from deſpair of forgiveneſs*, *although their ſins were never ſo great*, *ſince Chriſt pardoned him*, *after ſo great a ſin as denying him thrice*: This expoſition of *Theophylactus* is the ſame with that of *Ambroſius*, and *Euthymius* and *Maldonat* the *Jeſuit*, who upon this place hath theſe words, *Ambroſij*, *Theophylacti*, *& Euthymij interpretatio mihi non diſplicet*, *qui converſum exponunt à peccato*, *quo Chriſtum negavit*, *acta pœnitentia*, *quaſi aliis de ſuo vulnere fecerit medicinam*. In which words the *Jeſuit* expreſly aquieſceth in the expoſition of theſe Fathers Whence appears the notable ſophiſtry of *Bellarmin*, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 3. *de pont. Rom.* who interprets theſe words of our Savior, *Therefore when thou art converted*, *confirm thy brethren* thus. The ſenſe, ſaith he, of theſe words, is not that *Peter repenting him of his ſin, or converted, ſhould confirm the Apoſtles by his example*: but this, *Thou whoſe faith cannot be deficient*, *when thou ſees others vacillating*, *convert thy ſelf to them*, *and confirm them*.

They object many things here, as that *Theophylactus* affirmeth

meth, That *Peter* after his repentance shal recover *Primatum omnium*, and *Præfecturam orbis*: that *Ambrosius* affirms, *Petrus Ecclesiæ præponitur postquam tentatus à Diabolo est. Augustinus* also calls *Peter Rectorem Ecclesiæ, cui claves Regni Cælorum creditæ sunt.* But these objections are of no moment. And first, that *Theophylactus* affirms that *Peter* recovered the *Primacy above all*, it is nothing. For first, the meaning is no other, then *that he hath a chief place in the Church in dignity, not in Jurisdiction*: and it shal be proved, *cap.* 19. *&* 20. that not only the other Apostles are called *Principes* Primates, but also *Præfecti orbis*, and *Rectores Ecclesiæ.*

The ninth Prerogative of *Peter* is, that our Savior first of all appeared to him after his resurrrection: But it is answered, first, although it were true, it is of no moment to prove *Peter* Oecumenick Bishop. Secondly, it is notoriously false, because he appeared to *Mary Magdalene*, before ever he appeared to *Peter*, *Mark* 16. 19. before ever he appeared to his own mother, or to any of the Apostles. If *Bellarmin* answer, That *Mary Magdalen* was only a woman: It is replyed, It concluds, *Women had the Primacy over the Apostles*, if the Argument were of any force. Secondly, it is very probable, that our Savior appeared to these two disciples, going to *Emmaus*, before he appeared to any of the Apostles: for when they came back to *Jerusalem*, and found the *eleven* gathered together, then they affirmed, that the Lord was risen indeed, & had appeared to *Simon*: which is all that *Bellarmin* alledgeth to prove that Christ first appeared to *Peter*, except that of 1 *Corinth.* 15. *He appeared unto Cephas, and after that unto the eleven*: however, albeit it be very probable that our Savior appeared to *Peter*, before ever he appeared unto the other Apostles: yet it concludes no more that *Peter* had Primacy over the other Apostles, then that those two Disciples going to *Emmaus*, *had primacy over them*, since he appeared unto them, as well as unto *Peter*, before ever he appeared to the other Apostles.

The

The tenth Prerogative is taken from *John* 13. when our Savior *waſhing the Apoſtles feet*, did firſt waſh thoſe of *Peter*. It is anſwered firſt, Although it were true, it is of no moment to prove *Peter Oecumenick biſhop*. Secondly, it is only a conjecture of ſome Fathers, that *Peters feet were firſt waſhed*: it cannot be gathered from the text at all. *Auguſtinus* is of that opinion indeed, and ſo is *Nonnus* in his *Poetical paraphraſe*: but other Fathers are againſt it, as *Chryſoſtomus*, *Theophylactus*. *Bellarmin* urgeth here, that thoſe Fathers affirm, That *Judas only had his feet waſhed before Peter*: but what then? *Bellarmins* reaſon is very bad, concluding from that *waſhing*, *Peter* to be Oecumenick Biſhop, ſince *Judas* was waſhed before him: he inſtances *Judas* was a Traitor, and none of the other Apoſtles would have ſuffered our Savior to waſh their feet before theſe of *Peters*, but only *Judas*. But it is replyed, Firſt, if there had been any myſtery of Primacy *in that waſhing of feet*, our Savior would never *have waſhed the feet of Judas before thoſe of Peter*. Secondly, not only *Origines* and *Ambroſius* affirm, *That he waſhed the feet of other Apoſtles before thoſe of* Peter, (beſides *Judas*) *but alſo Popiſh Doctors affirm the ſame*, as *Aquinas*, *Lyranus*, and *Salmero* the *Jeſuit*.

The eleventh Prerogative is from *John* 21. 18. where our Savior ſaith to *Peter*, *But when thou ſhalt be old, thou ſhalt ſtretch forth thine hands, and another ſhal gird thee*. If ye demand what Prerogative is here? They anſwer that in thoſe words, Chriſt ſhows to *Peter what death he ſhould die*, viz. *That he ſhould be crucified as himſelf was*. But it is anſwered, Firſt, although it were true, it doth not conclude *Peter* to be *Oecumenick Biſhop*. Secondly, that our Savior foretold to *Peter a violent death* in thoſe words is more then probable: but that he foretold *the death of the croſs*, can no wayes be gathered from the words. And whereas they inſiſt upon *ſtretching forth of hands*, it is of no moment; ſince thoſe words do

not

not conclude *stretching forth of hands upon the cross necessarily*, since ones hands are stretched out when they are bound: which sort of *stretching*, our Savior questionless means by, as appears by these words, *When thou wast young, thou girdedst thy self, but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shal gird thee, and lead thee whither thou wouldest not.* The *Syrian* Interpreter, *Alius cinget lumbos tuos shall gird thy loins.* Interlinear Gloss, *cinget vinculis, shal gird thy loins.* *Lyranus* (convinced that stretching of hands was by *Cords*, and not by *Nails*) affirms, That *Peter* was crucified, being bound by cords upon the cross: which is a very ridiculous fancy: however, that by *stretching of hands*, is not meant *crucifying*, but only *binding*, appears by the following words; *and lead thee whither thou wouldest not.* It is notorious, that they use not to lead one who is crucified already any where.

The twelfth Prerogative is from *Acts* 1. 15. *And in those dayes Peter stood up in the midst of the Disciples.* Here they gae ther great things. First, that *Peter convocated the rest of the Apostles*; *Ergo*, he was Oecumenick Bishop. But first, it is *inconsequent*; although he had gathered them in one, it doth not follow, that he did so by *authority*, but only by *advice* and *counsel.* Secondly, it is notoriously false, that *Luke* in that place affirms any such thing as that the Apostles were convocated by *Peter.*

The second thing they gather, that *Peter* having proposed, *that one should be chosen in the place of Judas, they all obeyed his command.* But it is answered, *Peter* only uttered his opinion, (as any one of them might have done) that such a thing was necessary, and they followed his opinion. It is ridiculous to collect from thence any *authority of Peter over the rest.*

Salmeron the *Jesuit* collects, that *Peter represented Christ*, because *Luke* affirms, *He stood up in the midst of them.* But it is answered, It follows likewise, *that the little child*, *Mat.* 18.

and

and *the man with the withered hand*, *Mark* 3. and *Paul*, *Act.* 27. *Were visible heads of the Church.* That *standing in the mids*, imports no authority of it self, but rather a Ministrie, appears by *Luke* 22. 27. where our Savior affirms, *He was in the mids of them as a servant.*

The thirteenth Prerogative, is, from *Acts* 2. where after the Apostles had received the Holy-Ghost, *Peter* first of all, *did promulgat the Gospel.* But it is answered, First, although it were true, it is inconsequent to prove *Peter visible head of the Church*, as is notorious. Secondly, it is false, or at least not certain, that *Peter preached the Gospel first*: for *Luke* affirms, Before that time, the Apostles *spake with tongues* to the admiration of all the hearers, but questionless, what they spake was the Gospel.

The fourteenth Prerogative, is, from *Acts* 3. 6. Where *Peter cured the lame man.* If ye ask, what Prerogative is here, since *Paul* and other Apostles did equivalent miracles? They answer, *It was the first miracle the Apostles did after Christs Ascension.*

But it is replyed, What although it were? It doth not conclude *Peter* to be *Oecumenick Bishop.* Secondly, if it be not false, it is uncertain, for we read in the second chapter, that the Apostles did many miracles, which probably was before that time.

The fifteenth Prerogative, is, from *Acts* 5. Where *Peter killed with a word Annanias and Sapphira.* But it is answered, *Paul*, *Acts* 13. struck *Elimas the sorcerer with blindness with a word only, or in as miraculous a manner.*

The sixteenth Prerogative, is, from *Acts* 9. 32. *And it came to pass, as Peter walked throughout all quarters, he came also to the Saints that dwelt at Lydda.* If ye ask what they mean? They will tell you, *that Peter did the office of a General in an Army.* But it is false, that *Peter walked through the Saints,*

visiting them otherwise, then Paul did, (*Acts* 18.

The seventeenth Prerogative is from *Acts* 10 where *Peter preached first to the Gentiles, being commanded so to do in that vision.* But it is answered, Although *Peter* had first preached unto the *Gentiles*: it doth not conclude him *Oecumenick Bishop.* Secondly, if not false, it is at least not certain, because *Philip* his *preaching at Samaria*, and his *baptising of the Eunuch* are both mentioned by *Luke*, before that vision of *Peter* concerning *Cornelius.*

The eighteenth Prerogative, is, from *Acts* 12. Where it is affirmed, That the Church made *continual intercession* for *Peter*, when he was imprisoned. But it is answered, None but a Sophister, would object that to prove *Peter* Oecumenick Bishop. *Bellarmin* instances. That they prayed not for *James*, and *Stephen*: But it is answered, *Thats far worse Logick* to prove *Peter* Oecumenick Bishop. Secondly, it is impious in *Bellarmin* to affirm, That the Church did not pray for *Stephen* and *James*: although it be not mentioned, he cares not what he bable, because all he spoke, was received as Gospel by his disciples at *Rome.*

The nineteenth Prerogative is, from *Acts* 15. where *Peter first speaks, and all the rest followed his opinion.*

But it is answered first, That *Luke* mentions, that there was *great debate amongst them before Peter spake*: and therefore it is uncertain, that *Peter* spake first. Secondly, whereas they call that *speaking of Peters, a pronouncing of the sentence.* It is notoriously false, for *Lyranus* himself affirms, it was pronounced by *James, verse* 19. as it was indeed. The reason they give is, *Because James was Bishop of the place.* Thirdly, *Cardinal Carthusianus*, upon *Acts* 15. expressly affirms, That *James presided in the Council*, which quite destroys *the Supremacy of Peter* for an Oecumenick Bishop, who hath the only right of presiding in *Councils*, either by himself, when he is present, or else by his

Legats

Legats, when he is abſent. Fourthly, in the *Council of Baſil*, the Fathers of that Council denyed, that the Legats of the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould preſide in that Council, becauſe they never did read, that *Peter* did preſide in any Council. *Turre-Cremata*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 24. *Summæ de Eccleſ.* affirms the ſame: and for that reaſon *Paul*, *Galat.* 2. preferrs *James* to *Peter*; whence appears that it is falſe, that *Peter* preſided in that Council, and albeit he had preſided, it doth not conclude him *Oecumenick Biſhop*: for it ſhal be proved, *part.* 2. and *part* 3. that in the Council of *Nice*, and other General Councils, that thoſe who preſided in them were not Oecumenick Biſhops.

The twenty Prerogative, and laſt Scriptural is, from *Gala.* 1. where *Paul* affirms, That after three years, he went up to *Jeruſalem* to ſee *Peter*. But it is anſwered, All who were viſited by *Paul*, were not Oecumenick Biſhops: and here *Bellarmin* miſerably ſophiſticats in the Fathers. And firſt, he cites *Chryſoſtomus*, affirming that the reaſon was, becauſe *Peter* was *greater then himſelf*. But it is anſwered, That *Chryſoſtomus* words are *elder then himſelf*: for ſo he explains, *greater then himſelf*, ὡς μείζονα καὶ πρεσβύτερον, that this is *Chryſoſtom*'s meaning is evident, becauſe in the ſame place he affirms, *That Paul went to ſee Peter, not that he needed any thing from him, being equal to him.* He affirms alſo, *I ſay no more*, which is as much as in his opinion, *Paul was to be preferred to Peter.* In like manner, he ſophiſticats in *Hieronymus*, whom he brings in affirming *the reaſon of that viſit*, was, becauſe, *Peter was the firſt Apoſtle.* But it is anſwered, The meaning of *Hieronymus* is the ſame with that of *Chryſoſtomus by firſt Apoſtle*, he means either in *age*, or *dignity*, not in Juriſdiction, becauſe he expreſly affirms in the ſame place, That *Paul* came to ſee *Peter*, *non diſcendi ſtudio, qui & ipſe eundem prædicationis haberet Autorem, ſed honoris priori Apoſtolo deferendi, thas is not to learn any thing from him, but to do him honor as the firſt Apoſtle. Auguſtinus*

expressly calls it a *fraternal visit*, and so doth *Tertullianus*. *Lombardus* also affirms, The end of *Pauls* visit, was to shew *Peter* that he was his *Coapostolus*, or *fellow Apostle with him*, not *to learn any thing from him*. *Aquinas*, the other great Master of the School-men, affirms the same, *paraphrasing* upon the words of *Paul*, he saith, *Non ut discerem ab eo, sed ut visitarem eum*, *not to learn from him, but to see him.*

And thus we have waded through that immense Ocean of that dispute of *Bellarmins*, concerning the Scriptural Prerogatives of *Peter*, in which we have omitted nothing of moment, or what is worth the answering. *Bellarmin* alledgeth some testimonies of Fathers, shewing to favor (as he cites them) some of these Prerogatives of *Peter*: but he basely sophisticats, as we have given a *Specimen* in the chief of them, whose testimonies we have vindicated. He deludes his Reader in this, *viz.* because those Fathers acknowledge some of those Prerogatives, therefore by Sophistry, he would perswade his Reader that *Peter* was Oecumenick Bishop in their opinion, which was very far from their mind, as partly we have shewed in the former chapters, and partly shall shew in the following.

CHAP. XVII.

Of the Prerogatives of Peter *by Tradition.*

IN the former Chapter, we have disputed the Scriptural Prerogatives of *Peter*, twenty in number: now followeth Prerogatives of *Peter* by *tradition*, which are eighth in number. The first is, that *Euodius*, and some other affirm, That *Peter* only of all the Apostles was baptized by the hands of Christ.

But it is answered first, That *Euodius* testimony is not much to be regarded, *Baronius* himself thinks it not to be written by

by *Euodius*, becauſe the author of it affirms, *That* Steven *was martyred ſeven years after the death of Chriſt.* Secondly, he ſaith, The houſe in which our Savior celebrated the Supper, was in the houſe of *John* the Apoſtle, which directly contradicts, *Matthew* 26. *Mark* 14. and *Luke* 22. As for *Bellarmins* other witneſſes, *Nicephorus* and *Euthymius*, they have it from the ſaid ſuppoſititious *Euodius*: This *Euodius* was Patriarch of *Antiochia*, immediatly after the times of the Apoſtles, at leaſt called ſo, *in a large ſenſe*; For it ſhal be proved, *part.* 2. *lib.* 1. that no Patriarchs were eſtabliſhed before the *Council* of *Chalcedon.*

Secondly, Many of the Fathers expreſly affirm, That it is falſe, that Chriſt baptized *Peter.* So *Euthymius* himſelf (after he had recited the opinion of *Euodius*) *Eulogius in Photius, Bibliothec. cap.* 280. *Tertullianus, de Baptiſmo, cap.* 12. *Chryſoſtomus* on the *Acts, homil.* 1. who all affirm, That *Peter* and the other Apoſtles were baptized by *John* the *Baptiſt*; *Auguſtinus, epiſt.* 108. diſputs this queſtion, whither *John* or *Chriſt* baptized the Apoſtles? He is in doubt of it, but inclines moſt to that opinion, that they were baptized by Chriſt. Nevertheleſs, there is no *prerogative* in *Peter* there, ſince he ſpeaks of the Baptiſm of all the Apoſtles as well as *Peter.*

Thirdly, Although *Peter* had been baptized by Chriſt alone and not the other Apoſtles, it doth not conclude him to be *Oecumenick Biſhop.*

The ſecond *Traditional prerogative*, is, That only *Peter* was ordained Biſhop by Chriſt, and the other Apoſtles by *Peter*

But it is anſwered, It is a meer fable, contradicted by *Chryſoſtomus* on *Matthew, hom.* 5. Who affirms, That *James firſt obtained a Biſhoprick*: if that be true, then he was a Biſhop before *Peter*; And if before *Peter*, then he behoved to have been made Biſhop by Chriſt, ſince *Peter* could not make *James* a Biſhop, when he was not Biſhop himſelf.

Secondy

Secondly, It shall be proved in the last chapter of the book, that neither *Peter*, nor any of the Apostles were Bishops properly: but in a *large sense*, *as Bishop comprehends Apostle*, *Acts* 1.20. and in that sense, Christ himself is called a Bishop, 1. *Peter* 25.

The third *Traditional prerogative*, is, from *Acts* 8. Where *Peter* detected *Simon Magus*; the *tradition* is, that after that time, the same *Peter* extinguished him.

But is answered, Albeit it were true, that *Simon Magus* was killed by *Peter*, it doth not conclude him *Oecumenick Bishop*. *Bellarmin* instances, *That* Simon Magus *was Prince of Hereticks*, *whom* Peter *killed*: Ergo, Peter *was Oecumenick Bishop who killed him*. But it is answered: First, *Bellarmins* Scholars at *Rome*, may well approve of this way of disputation, but it is laught at else where. Secondly, that argument would conclude *Paul* to be *Oecumenick Bishop*, since *Cyrillus*, *Cathes. 6. Sulpitius*, *hist. Sacr. lib. 2. Ambrosius sermon. 66.* atribute the killing of *Simon Magus* joyntly to *Peter* and *Paul*.

Thirdly, That killing of *Simon Magus* by *Peter*, seems to be a fable, since those who reports it contradict other in the manner. *Hegesipus*, *lib. 3. cap. 2.* affirms, That *Simon Magus made wings to himself, and fell a flying*: *Clemens*, *lib. 6. cap. 9.* affirms, That he had no wings, *but only was carried in the Air by Devils*: *Sulpitius* calls them *two Devils*. Some of them, saith, *Simon Magus*, brake his neck in the fall, at the Prayer of *Peter*: Others that he brake only his thigh-bone.

Finally, All this story of *Peter* and *Simon Magus*, depends upon *Peters* being at *Rome*; but all the Ancients testimonies, who testified *Peter* was at *Rome*, depends upon the authority of *Papias*, whom *Eusebius* discrives to be the author of many fables, as shall be shewed at large, in the last chapter of this book. Where also it shal be proved, by unanswerable presumptions

ſumptions, that *Peter* was never at *Rome*: and that all *Bellarmins* proofs to the contrair, are of no moment.

The fourth *Ttraditional prerogative* of *Peter*, is, That *Peter by the command of Chriſt, fixed his Biſhoprick at* Rome, *which was the imperial City*: Ergo, Peter *was Oecumenick Biſhop*. But it is anſwered: Firſt, it doth not follow: Secondly, *Bellarmin* cannot prove by Scripture or Antiquity, *That Peter fixed his Biſhoprick at* Rome much leſs at the command of Chriſt. *Bellarmin* inſtanceth the authority of *Leo, ſermon. 1. de natali* Petri & Pauli. *But* it is anſwered; Firſt, *Leo* doth not affirm, That *Peter* was injoyned to his *Biſhoprick* at *Rome*, but only to preach the Goſpel as an Apoſtle, his words are, *Quum Apoſtoli imbuendi Evangelio mundum, diſtributis ſibi terrarum partibus, ſuſcepiſſent*, Petrus, *Princeps Apoſtolici ordinis ad arcem* Romani *deſtinatur imperij*. *But Paul* went alſo to *Rome*, for that end to preach the Goſpel as an Apoſtle. *But* this queſtion, if *Peter* were at *Rome*, and Biſhop of *Rome*? Shal be diſputed in the three laſt chapters of this book.

The fifth *traditional prerogative* of Peter, is, *That Chriſt appeared to him at the end of his life, or a little before he dyed: and when* Peter *asked him, whither he was going?* He anſwered, *he was come again to be crucified.*

But it is anſwered: Firſt, it contradicts Scripture, affirming, *Acts 3. 21. That the Heavens muſt contain him until the day of Judgement*. Secondly, the author of this fable is *Hegeſippus*, falſly believed to be him, who lived in the days of the Apoſtles; as *Baronius* affirms, *anno 69. num. 7. Origines hom. in John* 37. calls it *Appocryphal*. And albeit it were true, it doth not conclude *Peter* to be *Oecumenick Biſhop*: for *Bellarmin* himſelf affirms, That our Savior left the Heavens, and coming unto the Air, appeared unto *Paul*, *Acts* 9 4. and ſo that argument would conclude *Paul Oecumenick Biſhop* alſo. Where marke, how he is intangled, when he affirms, Chriſt

appeared

appeared to *Peter* in *Rome*, to prove that Peter *was at Rome*; when it is objected to him, *Acts* 3. 21. *That the Heavens should contain Christ till the last day*, and therefore contradicts Scripture, He answers, *Christ appeared to* Paul *in the Air*. But here to prove Peter *Oecumenick Bishop*, he affirms, *That our Savior after his Ascension, left Heaven but once, when he appeared to* Peter: Else he loseth time in declaiming so much upon this *prerogative*. For he must either deny that Christ appeared to *Paul* out of the Heaven: or else he cannot affirm, without Sophistry, that Christs appearing to *Peter* is a *prerogative*.

The sixth *traditional prerogative* of *Peter*, is, *That only these Churches were* Patriarchal *seats, which were founded by* Peter, *as* Rome, Alexandria, *and* Antiochia.

But it is a notorious untruth, For not only *Jerusalem* and *Constantinople*, but also many other Cities were *Patriarchal seats*: His proofs are shameless. As first, the sixth Canon of the *Council* of *Nice*, which mentions only these three *Patriarchal seats*; And likewise, the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, *Action* 16. But it is answered, these Councils mention only these three, in these Canons cited by *Bellarmin*: but the *Council* of *Nice* mentions *Jerusalem*, Canon 7. under the name of *Ælia*. As for the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, it mentions other *Patriarchal seats*, in many places, as Canon 28. it mentions him of *Constantinople*. Likewise, the second General *Council* of *Constantinople* mentions at least ten *Patriarchal seats in the East*. Secondly, if ye take the word *Patriarch strictly*, it shal be proved, *part.* 2. *lib.* 2. that there was no *Patriarch* before the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, established by Law. And therefore, it is false which *Bellarmin* affirms, That these three were ever held *Patriarchal seats only*, *because they were founded by* Peter; as shal be proved at large, *part.* 2. *lib.* 2. Thirdly, It is false which he affirms, *viz. That those Churches were called* Patriarchal, *because they were founded by* Peter: since it is notorious, that the dignity

dignity of *Biſhops*, *Metropolitans*, and *Patriarchs*, *depended upon civil reſpects, and not upon their Apoſtolick founders.* For firſt, the *Biſhop of Rome* had the firſt place, becauſe he was *Biſhop of the Old imperial City*: he of *Conſtantinople* the ſecond, becauſe he was *Biſhop of New Rome*, as appears by the third Canon of the ſecond General *Council* of *Conſtantinople*, by the 28. Canon of the fourth General *Council* of *Chalcedon*, by the 36 Canon of the fifth General *Council of Conſtantinople*. As for the other *Patriarchs*, *Baronius* himſelf, *ad annum* 39. *num* 10. hath theſe words, *Majores in inſtituendis ſedibus Eccleſiarum, non aliam miſſe rationem, quàm ſecundum provinciarum diviſionem, & prærogativas à* Romanis *antea ſtabilitas, quam plurima ſunt exempla.* And a little after, he affirms, *That the Patriarch of* Alexandria *was preferred to him of* Antioch, *becauſe* Ægypt *was* præfectura Auguſtalis; *And not* Antioch, *which was only a proconſulat of* Syria: And for that reaſon alſo, *It was preferred to* Jeruſalem, *becauſe* Jeruſalem *was under the ſaid proconſulat.* But if *Bellarmins* prerogative of *Peter* hold good, *Antioch* would be preferred to *Conſtantinople*, becauſe it was founded by the Apoſtle *Peter*: and alſo to *Alexandria*, becauſe it was only founded by *Mark*. But more of this, *part.* 2. *lib.* 2.

The ſeventh *traditional prerogative* is, *The feaſt of the chair of Peter*, *viz.* that there was a Feſtival day obſerved in the Church, of the inſtitution of *Peter*, in his Biſhoprick ever ſince his time.

But it is anſwered: Firſt, *Bellarmin* is very wary in this objection, in ſpeaking of the *Feaſt of Peters chair in general, not nameing which chair in particular.* Better hold his peace, for this feaſt was in remembrance of *Peters Biſhoprick* of *Antioch*, and not of *Rome*. If this argument have any force, it proves the *Biſhop of* Antioch *Oecumenick Biſhop, and not the Biſhop of* Rome.

Secondly, It is notoriously false, *That this feast was observed by the whole Church.* *Bellarmins* proofs are *Augustinus, Sermon* 15. *de Sanctis*: which book is proved by *Erasmus* to be forged; How ever it is of no moment, whether it be forged or not?

Thirdly, *Baronius* himself speaking of *Feasts, in honor of their Founders, or of Feasts observed by Churches for that Reason*, affirms (speaking of the Church of *Rome*) *That the feast of the foundation of that Church was late, and according to the example of some Oriental Churches.*

The last prerogative of *Peter*, is, That in old Epistles called *Literæ Formatæ*, ——after these words, *In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, the name of *Peter* was inserted. If ye answer, that it is but a late invention, *Bellarmin* will produce an Epistle of *Atticus* Bishop of *Constantinople* But it is replyed, Several makes mention of these *Literæ* called *Formatæ*; but of that sort as they are mentioned by *Bellarmin*, where the name of *Peter* is placed next after the *Trinity*; in such Letters, ye have no example of old, but of late in the *collections of the decretals, and Canon Law.* Ye find only two of them in *Gratianus, distinct.* 73. The first dated 1002. The second 1315. Ye find other of the win *Ivo. decret. part.* 6. *cap.* 134. and 135. As for that epistle of *Atticus*, any may see it forged: However it is of no moment, whether it be forged or not? He that would see the proofs of its Forgery, let him read *Chameir* upon this prerogative: However these *formatæ literæ*, were conceived thus, π, υ, α. which three letters signify *Father, Son*, and *Holy Ghost*; Then was written π the initial letter of *Peter*: next, *the first letter of his name who wrote the letter.* Secondly, *The second letter of his name to whom it was written.* Thirdly, *The third letter of his name, who carried the letter.* Fourthly, *The fourth letter of the name of the City, from which it was written, &c.* All these ceremonies

ceremonies were uſed to preveen miſcarrying, or *forging of letters.* And thus we have purged that *Augiæ Stabulum*, of that diſput of *Bellarmins*, concerning the prerogatives of *Peter*; And conſequently, anſwered all, what is objected by *Bellarmin* in this argument of prerogatives, for the ſupremacy of *Peter*, which is the fourth general argument, proving him *Oecumenick Biſhop* alledged by our adverſaries.

CHAP. XVIII.

Several Arguments from the Carriage of Peter, *diſproving his Supremacy.*

OUr Adverſaries in the three preceeding chapters, endeavored by all the Art they could, to prove the *ſupremacy of* Peter by his *prerogatives*; moſt of which were in his carriage. In this chapter, we will ſhortly minute ſome arguments from the *carriage of Peter* that he could not be *Monarch of the Church ordained by Chriſt.* And it is very ſtrange, that our adverſaries ſhould have endeavored to prove the *ſupremacy of* Peter by his carriage, ſince *Salmero* the *Jeſuit*, in his Commentaries upon the *Firſt of* Peter, ingenuouſly confeſſeth, nothing can be gathered from his carriage, to prove his *ſupremacy.* And conſequently, he acknowledgeth all theſe arguments, proving his *ſupremacy from his carriage*, to be nothing elſe but *ſophiſms.* That the arguments from his carriage, diſproving his *ſupremacy*, are no *ſophiſms*, appears by what followeth, we will only mention three. The firſt is this, it appears by *Acts* 8. 14: *That* Peter *and* John *were delegated by the Apoſtles, who were in* Jeruſalem *to preach the Goſpel in* Samaria: but an *Oecumenick Biſhop*, cannot be *delegated*, as is notorious. Who would take upon them to ſend the *Biſhop of Rome* in commiſſion now-a-days? They anſwer to this argument variouſly.

Panigarolla, *disc. 6.* answers, That it was by *Peters own procurement, that he was sent by the other Apostles:* but he only guesseth, his answer hath no warrand in the text, and by such answers as his, any passage of Scripture, albeit never so evident, may be eluded.

Bellarmin, *Stapleton, Sanderus, Salmero,* and Baronius, *anno* 35. *num.* 9. affirms, That it is not inconsistent with *Equals*, to be sent from their *Equals.* They give many instances: The first is, *That GOD the Father sent Christ, and both sent the Holy Ghost*: but that instance is ridiculous; not being a *Mission of like Nature* with that of *Peter from the other Apostles.* Likewise, the *Father, Son,* and *Holy Ghost,* is from *Equals*: but that *Mission of* Peter was from those (as the *Roman Doctors* maintain) *under his own authority.*

They instance, secondly, *Herod sent the wise men to Bethlehem*; but he had no authority over them. But it is answered, First, *That the wise men had no authority over Herod*: the state of the question is, *Whether* Peter *had authority over the other Apostles?* The force of the argument consists in this, that since they sent him, or *delegated him,* he had none: and consequently, *he was not Oecumenick Bishop.* Secondly, *Herod did not delegate the wise men,* not ἀποστεῖλας but πέμψας, between which two verbs there is great difference; the first signifying *a sending with authority*: the second many times *a dimission only*; as appears in several *Classick Authors,* having the same signification with ἀποπέμψας. So *Homer Odyss.* 15. and other where.

Their third instance, is from *Joshua* 22. *Where the people sent* Phinehas *the High-Priest to the* Reubenites *and* Gadites: Josephus *also,* lib. 20. cap. 7. Antiquit. *relats, That* Ishmael *the High-Priest was sent to* Nero, *by the people of the Jews.*

But it is answered, These instances are not to the purpose: And first, *Phinehas* was not *High-Priest, but only the Son of* Eleazar

Eleazar *the High-Prieſt*; & it is great impudence in *Stapleton* to affirm, he was *High-Prieſt*: *Bellarmin* calls him not High-Prieſt, but only *Prieſt*; but he reaſons from him, as he were *High Prieſt*. As for *Iſhmael*, *Bellarmin* takes no heed that he was ſent as a Legat, (as *Ruſinus* interprets) but *Bellarmin* will not grant that *Peter was ſent as a Legat*; neither will he grant that *Iſhmael* being a Legat, was greater then theſe who ſent him: *Bellarmin* uſeth other inſtances of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, ſent, *Acts* 15. from the Church of *Antioch* to *Jeruſalem*, who were the chief Doctors of the Church. Whence, ſaith he, To be ſent doth not import, that *theſe who ſent them were greater then they*.

But it is anſwered: Firſt, The queſtion is not, whether the Apoſtles who ſent *Peter*, were greater then he? But whether he was greater then they were? We do not affirm, The other *Apoſtles were greater then* Peter, but only ſince they ſent him as a *Legat*, he was not greater then the other *Apoſtles*. Secondly, *Acts* 15. the *Greek* verbs πέμπειν, and ἀποστέλλειν, are not uſed by *Luke*, but the verb ἀποπέμπειν; which ſignifies a *honorable deduction*, or *dimiſſion*: And ſo *Cajetanus* the Cardinal, and *Salmero* the Jeſuit, interpret the place.

Fiſher, Biſhop of *Rocheſter*, affirms, That *Pius* ſecond (the Cardinal thinking it fit) had an *intention to go againſt the Turks in perſon*.

But it is anſwered, He had no intention to go in commiſſion from the Cardinals, but only to follow their advice.

Stapleton inſtances, *So did Peter go to Samaria out of his own accord, not neceſſitated by any authority*. But he is refuted by the *Greek* verb ἀποστέλλειν, which evermore ſignifies *a ſending with authority*, as appears by *John* 1. where it is ſaid, That the *Jewes ſent Prieſts and Levites to Jeruſalem*. And likewiſe, 2 *Timothy* 4. *Tychicus was ſent to Epheſus*. And likewiſe, *Acts* 11. *Barnabas was ſent*: in all which miſſions, the great verb ἀποστέλλειν, and not πέμπειν is uſed, but not ſo, *Acts* 10. when *Paul* was ſent from *Antioch*. The

The best solution of all is given by *Renatus* a Sorboniſt, who grants, that *Peter* was ſent by the other Apoſtles, as *Legat*, and leſs in authority then they. But (ſaith he) it doth not follow he was not Oecumenick Biſhop; *becauſe the authority of the whole Church, is more then the authority of an Oecumenick Biſhop.* It cannot be denyed, that this anſwer of *Renatus* takes away the force of the Argument. But it is much doubted, that this anſwer is owned at *Rome*: ſince the doctrine of the *particular Church of Rome* (the infallibiliy of which is defended by *Bellarmin* and all the *Italians*) is, *that the authority of the Biſhop of Rome is above a General Council*: which after many debates and oppoſitions in the Council of *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, at laſt was concluded in the Council of *Florence*: whence the argument is yet in force againſt the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, although not againſt *Renatus*, and others of his opinion.

The ſecond argument againſt the Supremacy of *Peter*, from his carriage, *Acts* 11. 3. where *he was challenged by the brethren for going in to men uncircumciſed.* The Argument is this, *An Oecumenick Biſhop cannot be queſtioned for any thing he doth; but* Peter *was queſtioned*: Ergo, *He was not an Oecumenick Biſhop.* The firſt propoſition is proved from the Canon Law, in *Gratianus, Diſtinct.* 40. Canon *Si Papa.* Where it is expreſly affirmed, and likewiſe, *Diſtinct.* 19. and *Cauſ.* 17. *quæſt.* 4. And likewiſe in the ſame diſtinction, 19. *cap. in memoriam.* The words are, *Licet vix ferendum ab illa ſancta ſede imponatur jugum, tamen feramus, & pia devotione toleremus,* But the Gloſs in the *Decretals, cap. quantò Perſonam de tranſlatione Epiſcopi,* affirms, That the Biſhop of *Rome* hath *cæleſte arbitrium, & ideo naturam rerum mutare. ſubſtantialia unius rei applicando alii, & de nullo poſſe aliquid facere, & ſententiam quæ nulla eſt, facere aliquam: neceſſe qui ei dicat, Cur ita facis? poſſe enim ſupra jus diſpenſare, & de injuſtitia facere juſtitiam, corrigendo jura, & mutando: demum plenitudinem obtinere poteſtatis*

testatis, By which it appears expresly, that none will question an Oecumenick Bishop. And Since *Peter* was questioned by those men, it is evident, they did not acknowledge him Oecumenick Bishop.

Bellarmin, lib. 1. cap. 16. mentions this Argument, but doth not answer it, but falls *in a digression*, endeavoring to prove, that *Peter was not ignorant of that mystery, of the calling of the Gentiles before that vision, Acts* 10. but he seems expresly to contradict Scripture, as appears to any having the use of reason, considering both that vision, and also his speech meeting with *Cornelius, vers.* 34.

Stapleton in Relect. Controvers. 3. quæst. 1. art. 3. and in other places answers, *That it is the duty of a good Pastor to show himself ready, to give an account of his actions, to any who calls them in question.*

But it is replyed, *Stapleton* saith truth, and *Peter* so in the same place: but he takes not away the force of the Argument, since in the fore-cited passages of the Canon Law, it is forbidden by the Pope himself, *to call what he doth in question*, since he is bound to give an account of his actions to no *power earthly*, either *spiritual* or *temporal*, but only to God.

The third Argument is almost like the second, but more puzling, It is then from *Galat.* 2. 11. where the Apostle *Paul* affirms, *That in Antiochia he resisted Peter to his face, for he was to be blamed*; which quite destroys the Supremacy of *Peter* in two particulars: First, *that he was blamed and resisted.* Secondly, *That he was deservedly resisted.* This objection puts the Roman Doctors by the ears together how to answer it: The most ingenuous among them confess, that *Paul* in those words expresly *thought himself equal to Peter*; *otherwise, he durst not have spoken them.* So *Lombardus. Cajetanus* affirms, That *Paul* in these words, *thought himself greater then* Peter. The other Doctors answer variously.

And

And first, *Carerius* and *Pighius*, following *Clemens Alexandrinus*, mentioned by *Eusebius*, *hist. lib.* 1. *cap.* 14. affirme, *That it was not* Peter *the Apostle, but an other* Cephas, *who was reprehended by* Paul. But this opinion is ridiculous; for Paul *is comparing himself in those words, to the chief of the Apostles, one of which was* Peter: whereby it is evident, that it was Peter *the Apostle whom he resisted, and not an other* Peter; and therefore this opinion is exploded by *Hieronymus*, and other Fathers.

The second answer, is of *Gregorius de Valentia*, *Pighius*, and *Carerius*, following *Chrysostomus*, and *Hieronymus*, affirming, *That it was but a dissimulation, and the reprehension proceeded from* Paul, *by paction between him and* Peter: viz. *That* Peter (the Jews arriving) *should leave the Gentiles, that* Paul *might have occasion to reprehend him:* And consequently, *that the Jews might be instructed of the calling of the Gentiles by* Pauls *reprehension.*

But it is answered, This Argument is laught at by *Augustinus*, as not becoming *the gravity of* Paul, *who had sworn before, that he lyed not.*

Others affirm, That Peter *erred not in faith*, (so *Sanderus, and Stapleton*) but only in *conversation.*

But it is answered, The less his error was by the said reprehension, the less it appears he was *Oecumenick Bishop*: for if *he erred not in faith, no body should have presumed to resist him, as is expresly forbidden, by the fore-cited Canons of the Canon Law.*

Baronius answers, That *Peter erred not at all* But it is false, *and gives the lye unto the Apostle* Paul, who affirms, He was to be *blamed.*

Bellarmin answers another way, *viz. That one may reprehend another, although superior in Authority, if it be done with reverence*, as *Paul did* Peter *here.* He cites *Augustinus, epist.* 19 to

to *Hieronymus*, and *Gregorius Magnus*, *homil.* 18. on *Ezekiel*, who expreſly affirms, *That Peter was greater then* Paul, *and yet he was reprehended by him.*

But it is anſwered, That takes not away the force of the argument: Firſt, becauſe the queſtion is not, *Whether Peter was greater then Paul? But whether he was Oecumenick Biſhop? Bellarmin* will not affirm, That an *Oecumenick Biſhop may be reprehended*; elſe he will not only contradict the *Canon Law*, (as we ſhewed, and which they make of equal authority with the Scripture) but alſo himſelf, *lib.* 4. *cap* 5. *de Pont. Rom.* where he affirms, *That if the Pope command Vice, and forbid Vertue, the Church is bound to believe that Vice is Vertue, and Vertue Vice.* Secondly, it expreſly appears by the words of *Paul*, *Gal.* 2. *That he made himſelf equal to Peter*, as is acknowledged by the *ordinar gloſs*, *Lombardus*, *Cajetanus*: yea, *Chryſoſtomus*; after he hath gathered from the words of *Paul*, that he was equal to *Peter*; he adds, *Ne dicam amplius*, by which words, he thinks *Paul was greater then Peter.* Thirdly, The Doctrine of *Paul* was preferred to that of *Peter*, that of *Peter* being found *diſſimulation*, and that of *Paul ſincere Chriſtian Doctrine.*

It is needleſs to examine the anſwers of others, as of *Stapleton* and *Eckius*, yet we will mention two other anſwers. The one of *Aquinas*, the other of Cardinal *Pool*; that of *Aquinas*, and *Eckius* is almoſt all one, *viz. They grant that* Peter *and* Paul *was alike.* But they diſtinguiſh, *that Paul was equal to* Peter *in the execution of authority, but not in authority of Government, in executione Autoritatis, non in autoritate regiminis.*

But it is anſwered, This diſtinction of *Thomas* is a plain riddle: It would puzle *Oedipus* himſelf. It is ordinar with Sophiſters to imitate that fiſh, *called Sepia*: when it is caught, it vomits up a black humor like ink, to deceive the fiſhers: none can conceive this diſtinction of *Thomas* without contradiction.

For if *Paul* were equal to *Peter in the execution of Authority*: he was equal also to him *in the authority of Government*; since the execution of Authority is the Act flowing from the other, or from the Authority of Government: if the same be the *authority* of both *Peter* and *Paul*? This cantradiction is inevitable, but if the Authority of *Peter* be greater then that of *Paul*, he still contradicts himself, in affirming *Paul* was *equal* to *Peter* in the execution of authority, no subordinat Magistrat can be *equal* in the execution of Authority to the *Supreme Magistrat*.

Eckius distinguisheth more to the purpose, *viz.* between the Office of an Apostle in *teaching* and *governing*. *Paul* was equal to *Peter* the first way, and therefore, he reprehended him, not *the second way*.

But it is replyed first, Albeit this distinction were granted, it doth not take away the force of the Argument: which consists in this, whether *Paul* were greater or less then *Peter*? it is nothing to the purpose? An *Oecumenick Bishop*, according to the Canon Law, ought to be questioned by none: and since *Paul* questioned *Peters* actions, it is evident according to the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, that *Peter* was not *Oecumenick Bishop*: neither is it of any moment, that the Canon Law provides, *that a Pope may be questioned for Heresie*: since that sort of questioning is antiquated by the Council of *Florence*, and the constant Practice of the Modern Church of *Rome*. Neither was the error of *Peter* an *Heresie*, but only *an action* of *dissimulation*.

Secondly, the distinction of it self is contradictory for two reasons. First, because *Government of the Church pertains to the office of an Apostle*, all the Apostles *having exercised all the parts of that Government*. Secondly, this reprehension of *Paul* was *directly in execution of the authority of Government*, because Government comprehends reprehension of transgressors

ſors, both in doctrine and manners, or actions. But in this particular, the actions of *Peter* were reprehended by *Paul.*

Cardinal *Pool*, a very Learned man, retorts the Argument, *lib. 2. de unitate Eccleſiæ*, where he affirms, *This reprehenſion of Peter by Paul, concludes Peter to be Oecumenick Biſhop*: but he tells not how? *Baronius* (it ſeems) explains him, *anno 53. num. 46.* the argument is very pretty, *viz. They who followed the example of* Peter *Judaizing, preferred it to the decree of the Council of* Jeruſalem. *Ergo, they believed his authority was above that of the Council, and of* Paul; yea *Barnabas himſelf followed Peter before either the Council or Paul.*

But it is anſwered (to omit that it is not certain, whether this diſſimulation of *Peters* was before or after the Council of *Jeruſalem*) *Baronius* had reaſoned far better thus, *Paul preferred the decree of the Council to the fact of Peter, reprehending Peter in his face*, Ergo; *Peter was not Oecumenick Biſhop.* For albeit thoſe *Judaizing* had preferred the example of *Peter* to the decree of the Council: it doth not follow, that *Peter was above a Council*, except they had *rightly preferred the example of* Peter *to the decree of the Council.* And this much of the cartiage of *Peter*, and his Inſtitution. We have omitted hitherto nothing of moment, pretended by either ſide, aſſaulting, or aſſerting the Supremacy of *Peter* from his *Inſtitution, Prerogatives* and *Carriage.* It remains only now to diſput the Supremacy of *Peter*, *pro* and *contra*, by teſtimonies of Fathers. And firſt we will examin the teſtimonies of *Bellarmin, cap. 19. & 20.* where he uſeth many repetitions, (according to his cuſtom) of teſtimonies diſputed already. In the next place we will examine teſtimonies of Fathers pretended by Proteſtants, *cap. 21.* and with them abſolve this diſput of the Supremacy of *Peter.*

CHAP. XIX.

Teſtimonies of Fathers examined, ſeeming to prove the authority of Peter *over the Church.*

HItherto our adverſaries have diſputed the ſupremacy of *Peter* from his inſtitution, prerogatives and carriage, now they endeavour, to prove it by teſtimonies of Fathers, from which they muſter up an army of Teſtimonies, in number 24. which *Bellarmine* affirms to be the Oracles of the 24 Elders in the *Revelation*, and that nothing can be anſwered to thoſe teſtimonies, except that anſwer of *Luther* and *Calvin* to the teſtimonies of *Leo*, (viz.) *that they were men, and conſequently might erre*: but it will appear, by the Proteſtants anſwers, that theſe teſtimonies are not ſo invincible. All thoſe teſtimonies may be reduced to two general Claſſes; the firſt is, in which *Peter* is compared with the whole Church; the ſecond, wherein he is compared with the other Apoſtles: the firſt Claſſe again is ſubdivided in ſeveral ſorts, according to the diverſity of attributes given to *Peter*.

The firſt kind, are thoſe teſtimonies wherein Chriſt ſaith to *Peter*, *upon this Rock*, &c. *feed my Sheep*, *I will give to thee the Keys*, &c. which is the third time that *Bellarmine* hath repeated them; and therefore it is ſufficient to anſwer, as before, that nothing was given peculiar to *Peter*; as was not only aſſerted by thoſe Fathers mentioned by *Bellarmine*, as *Origen* and others, but likewayes proved by them.

The ſecond ſort are of thoſe Fathers affirming, *that the care of the whole Church was committed to* Peter, which he proves by the teſtimonies of *Chryſoſtomus*, in his his 55. Homile upon *Matthew*, where *Peter* is called *Paſtor Eccleſiæ*, *Paſtor of the*

Church: and likewayes of *Maximus* sermon 3. *de Apostolis*, of *Gregorius*, *lib.* 4. *epist.* 32. who both affirm, *that the care of the whole Church was committed to* Peter.

But it is answered, so was it to all the Apostles in those words, *Go and teach all Nations*, *Matth.* 28. 2. *Chrysostomus* in many places affirms, that *Paul* had a care of the whole World, that he had *Orbis præfecturam*, *Homilia* 22. in 1. *Cor.* And likewayes, that all the Apostles had the care of the whole Church, *Hom.* 87. upon *John*: he likewayes affirms, that *Timothy* governed the whole World, *Hom.* 1. to the people of *Antioch*; and likewayes that *Timothy* took upon him *præfecturam totius orbis*, *Orat.* 6. against the Jews: whereby it appears, that by *Peters having care of the whole Church*, he is not proved to be œcumenick Bishop, since others had the same care of the whole Church. Nevertheless, *Bellarmine* useth two cheats, the first is in citing *Chrysostomus*, calling Peter *Pastor of the whole Church*, whereas the Greek imports only *he erected his mind*, *and made him* Pastor: his second cheat is, in citing *Gregorius*, as if his meaning were, that Peter was œcumenick Bishop, because the care of the whole Church was committed to him; whereas it is notorious, that *Gregorius* in those words, is disputing against an œcumenick Bishop; amongst other reasons he brings for one, *although the care of the whole Church was committed to* Peter, *yet he was not universal Apostle*; which last words *Bellarmine* fraudulently supresseth.

The third rank of testimonies are those, calling Peter *head of the Church*: as of *Chrysostomus*, Hom. 55. on Matth. *of Cyprianus* ad *Jubaianum*; of *Augustine*, sermon 125. *de tempore*; of *Hugo Ethereanus*, *lib.* 3. against the *Grecians*.

But it is answered, first, that those testimonies prove nothing: as for *Cyprianus*, he is not speaking of Peter at all; his words are only *Ecclesiæ unius caput, & radicem tenemus*; that

that is, *we abide in the unity of the Church, which is one, and head of the faithful:* But of this testimony, more hereafter: It is sufficient to tell for the present, that *Pamelius* (who useth to catch the least advantages for the supremacy of *Peter*) in his Annotations upon those words of *Cyprian*, mentions nothing to that purpose; as for *Chrysostomus*, he calls not *Peter head of the Church* at all; it is only *Trapizuntius* who translates him unfaithfully: as for *Augustinus*, those books *de tempore*, no learned man will affirm to be his, for two reasons, the first is, because he calls *Peter* the foundation, not only of the Church, but also of the Faith, which is far from *Augustinus* mind, who interprets the *Rock* or *Foundation*, not to be *Peter*, at all; for which *Bellarmine* and others tax him of ignorance, as we said before. The second reason is, because he calls *Peters* denying of Christ, *Exiguum peccatum*, a small sin, but non aggravates it more then *Augustinus*: as for *Hugo Ethereanus*, he lived but of late in the twelfth Age, according to *Bellarmine*, but in the fifteenth according to others; and therefore, his testimony can no more be regarded by the Protestants, then the testimony of *Luther* and *Calvin* by *Bellarmine*.

Secondly, albeit *Peter* were proved to be *head of the Church* by those testimonies, it doth not prove that he was *œcumenick Bishop*; because others beside *Peter*, are also called *heads of the Church* by the Fathers; *Martyrius* is called *Præses and head of the Church*, *epist.* 1. *incert. Patriarch. in corpore juris græco Romani*. *Athanasius* is called *head of all men*, by *Basilius*, *epist.* 52. *Paul* is called *head of nations*, by *Gregorius*, 1. in his fourth book upon *Kings* 1. *James* and *John* are likewise called *heads* by *Chrysostomus*, in his 26. *Homile* upon the *Acts*: yea, all Pastors and Doctors are called *heads* by *Gregorius* second Bishop of *Rome*, in his Epistle to *Germanus* of *Constantinople*, in the second Synod of *Neice*. By which

teſtimonies it appears, that the words *Caput* or *head* infers not an œcumenick Biſhop, but either a primacy of order, or rather eminency in gifts; and ſo it is taken by *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 12.

The fourth rank of teſtimonies are thoſe, ſtiling *Peter Biſhop of the Chriſtians*, *Chriſtianorum Pontifex primus*: for which, *Bellarmine* produceth *Euſebius* in his *Chron. anno.* 44.

But it is anſwered, firſt, that there are no ſuch words in the Greek text of *Euſebius*, reſtored by *Scaliger*. Secondly, although it were proved by *Euſebius*, it doth not conclude that *Peter* was œcumenick Biſhop, becauſe it appears that *Cyprianus* (*epiſt* 69.) when he was demanded to have him *Martyred*, was called *Epiſcopus Chriſtianorum*, *Biſhop of the Chriſtians*; but (ſaith *Bellarmine*) *Peter* was called by *Euſebius*, *firſt Biſhop of the Chriſtians*; but not ſo *Cyprianus*. But, (ſay the proteſtants) the word *Firſt*, imports only a priority of order, dignity or time, and not of juriſdiction; many of the Fathers gave to *Peter* that title of *Firſt*, or *primus*, becauſe they believed that he was firſt ordained Apoſtle; ſo *Cyprianus*, *&c.*

The fifth rank of teſtimonies are thoſe, affirming that there is *Una Cathedra*, &c. *one Chair of* Peter: *which was placed at* Rome; *in which Chair*, *Unity was preſerved by all, neither did the reſt of the Apoſtles conſtitute any other Chairs againſt that one Chair in which* Peter *ſat firſt*: To whom ſucceeded *Linus*, &c. *Optatus*, *lib.* 2. againſt *Parmenianus*; *in which words* (ſaith *Bellarmine*) *ye have the Chair of* Peter *and his ſucceſſors*, *called* the Chair of the whole Church, *which infers*, *that according to* Optatus, Peter *was œcumenick Biſhop.*

But it is anſwered, that *Optatus* in thoſe words, is diſputing againſt the Donatiſts, who had ſet up a Biſhop of their

their own faction at *Rome*, in oppoſition to the true Bi-
"ſhop: Which *Optatus* reprehends, Becauſe (ſaith he)
"there is but one Chair at *Rome* founded by *Peter*; in
"which firſt himſelf ſat, and then his ſucceſſors; in which
"place, (*viz.*) *Rome*, none of the other Apoſtles did con-
"ſtitute another Chair, much leſſe ye ought to ſet an-
"other Biſhop in that Chair, in oppoſition to the ſucceſ-
"ſors of *Peter*. That this is his meaning (*viz.*) that he ſpeaks of the particular Church of *Rome*, and not of the univerſal Church, is evident, becauſe otherwayes it were notoriouſly falſe which he affirms, *that no Chair was conſtituted by the other Apoſtles: For* James *did conſtitute a* Church *at* Jeruſalem, *and* John *at* Epheſus, *&c.*

The ſixth rank, are the teſtimonies affirming *Peter* to be *Magiſter Eccleſiæ*, *a Maſter of the Church*; likewayes, that the Church is called, *Eccleſia Petri*, Ambroſius, Sermon 11.

It is anſwered, firſt, that not only *Eraſmus*, but alſo *Coſterus* (a ſtiff maintainer of the Pope) denyes *Ambroſius* to be the Author of thoſe Sermons. 2. Although he were, it imports not much for calling *Peter a Maſter of the Church*, he calls him no other thing then an Apoſtle; For all Apoſtles governed the whole Church, or were Paſtors of the whole Church, as we ſaid before. 3. Whereas we ſaid another calleth the Church, *the Church of* Peter, he ſpeaks very improperly; ſuch kind of ſpeaking is not found in *Scripture*, or in Fathers: perhaps his meaning is, that it is the Church of *Peter*, becauſe it was the Church in which *Peter* taught, and in that ſenſe it may be called the Church of *Paul* alſo, or of any other of the Apoſtles, although properly the Church is only the Church of Chriſt, and of none other.

The ſeventh rank is, of teſtimonies preferring the Chair

of

of *Peter* to other Chairs, *Augustinus*, *de Baptismo*, *lib.* 2. It is answered, *Augustins* words are, *Quis nescit, Apostolatus principatum cuilibet Episcopatui præferendum? Who is ignorant, that the principality of the Apostleship is to be preferred to any Bishoprick?* In which words, it cannot be conjectured what *Bellarmine* can gather for the Supremacy of *Peter? Augustine* in these words, is comparing *Cyprian* with *Peter* in one respect, he prefers *Peter* to *Cyprian*, because (saith he) *the principality of the Apostleship is to be preferred to any* Bishoprick, *or* Peter, because an Apostle is to be preferred to *Cyprian*, who is only a Bishop. But in the words following, he saith, *Albeit their Chairs be unequal, yet the glory of both the Martyrs is the same*, in which words he seems in a manner equal to *Peter*.

Eighthly, *Bellarmine* cites a testimony from the *Thesaurus* of *Cyrullus* for the Supremacy of *Peter*, (*viz.*) *That Christ got the Scepter of the Church of the Gentiles from God, which he gave unto* Peter *and unto his successors only, and unto none other.*

But it is answered, that the testimony is suppositious and forged, being not found at all in any Edition of that Book: It is only mentioned by *Thomas Aquinas, in Opusculo, contra Græcos*, in his little Book he wrote against the Græcians, and some think he forged it: but *Thomas* was a most holy man, and it is more like he was abused by some others.

Ninthly, *Bellarmine* cites some testimonies from *Bernardus* and others, who lived after the sixth Century; but those testimonies, especially of the Latines, who lived at that time, cannot be regarded, because they lived after that time in which *Bonifacius* 3. was ordained œcumenick Bishop by *Phocas*: Such testimonies for the Supremacy of *Peter*, can have no more force, then the testimonies of

Bellarmine

Bellarmine or *Baronius*, or any other Doctor of the Church of *Rome*.

Tenthly, he cites the teſtimonies of *Leo*, and the other Biſhops of *Rome*; but neither can thoſe be regarded, becauſe they lived after the time in which the Biſhop of *Rome*, and the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* contended for the primacy. If *Bellarmine* will not believe the Proteſtants, that thoſe teſtimonies are of no moment, let him conſider what is ſaid by *Æneas Sylvius* (ſometimes Pope himſelf) who in his firſt Comen. upon the Councill of *Baſil*, hath theſe words, *Thoſe miſerable men are not aware, that thoſe teſtimonies which they ſo magnify, are either* (*ipſorum ſummorum, Pontificum Fimbrias ſuas extendentium*) *Are either of Popes themſelves enlarging their authority, or elſe of their flatterers.*

Bellarmines eleventh teſtimony, is taken from *Euſebius Caſarienſis*, *lib.* 2. *hiſt. cap.* 14. who affirms, *Peter* is, γενναῖος τῦ Θεῦ στρατηγὸς, *Captain of the Militia of God.* In which teſtimony, he triumphs as if he had found out the whole buſineſſe; *What elſe* (ſaith he) *can be the meaning of* Euſebius, *then that* Peter *is head of the Church Militant?*

But it is anſwered, firſt, that *Bellarmine* (following the verſion of *Chriſtopherſon*) cites *Euſebius* fraudulently, whoſe words are not, στρατηγὸν τῦ Θεῦ, but ὃς οἷα τις γενναῖος τῦ Θεῦ στρατηγὸς. That is, *Not Captain of the Militia of God* [ſimply.] But, *as one of the Captains of the Militia of God.* Secondly, *Iſidorus Peluſiota*, *lib.* 3. *epiſt.* 25. gives the ſame Epithet to *Paul*, calling him a moſt generous and valiant Captain, γενναῖον στρατηγὸν, and conſequently, *Bellarmine* triumphs before the Victory, ſince that teſtimony of *Euſebius* concludes *Peter* no more to be œcumenick Biſhop, then that of *Iſidorus*, *Paul.* And this much of thoſe

those testimonies cited by *Bellarmine*, for proving the Supremacy of *Peter* over the Church, which was the first Classe.

CHAP. XX.

Testimonies of Fathers, proving the Authority of Peter *over the Apostles.*

THe second Classe of testimonies, consists of those, proving the Supremacy of *Peter* over the Apostles, for which *Bellarmine* cites *Cyprian*, *epist.* 71. but he sets not down the words of *Cyprian*, but only summs them thus, *When* Paul *reprehended* Peter, Peter *did not answer; I have the primacy, ye most obey me, and not I you: Ergo*, saith *Bellarmine*, *according to* Cyprian, Peter *had the primacy over* Paul.

But it is answered, that this Logick is very strange, because *Cyprian* affirms, that *Peter* did not say unto *Paul*, *I have the primacy*; Ergo, *according to* Cyprian, Peter *had the Supremacy.* It would seem rather by these words, that *Cyprian* thought *Peter* had not the Supremacy. The words of *Cyprian* (which *Bellarmine* suppresseth) are, *Nec* Petrus *vendicavit sibi, aliquid insolenter aut arroganter assumpsit, ut diceret se primatum tenere*, &c.

That is, *Peter* being reprehended by *Paul*, did not take any thing to himself insolently or arrogantly, as to say, he had the primacy; from which words of *Cyprian*, it followes rather, that if *Peter* had said to *Paul*, *he had the primacy*, he had been arrogant and insolent; and consequently it appears rather that *Cyprian*, in these words, denyeth *Peter* to have the Supremacy: It seems *Pamelius* understands him so, for he answers (in his Annotations upon that

that place) this very passage of *Cyprian*, as an objection against the Supremacy of *Peter*.

In the next place, *Bellarmine* brings a number of very specious testimonies, to prove the Supremacy of *Peter* over the other Apostles, as that *Basilius* affirms, *he was preferred to the other Apostles*; Nazianzenus, *That the other Apostles were inferiour to him*; Epiphanius, *that he was Captain of the Apostles*; Cyrillus Hierosolym, *that he was prince of the Apostles*; Cyrillus, Allexand. *That he was Prince and head of the rest*; Theophyl. *Prince of the disciples*; Oecumenius, *he obtained the precedency of the other Apostles*; Hieronymus, *he was chosen head of the twelve, that occasion of Schisme might be removed*: The Author of the question upon the Old and New Testament, placed amongst the works of *Augustinus*, *he was made their head, that he might be Pastor of the flock of Christ*.

Those testimonies in effect, at the first veiw, seem to be of moment, but well considered do not prove at all, that *Peter* had any jurisdiction over the other Apostles; or that he was their œcumenick Bishop, for two very relevant reasons. The first is, because those very Epithets are given by the Fathers, yea by *Paul* himself to other Apostles, beside *Peter*. But since those Appellations doth not prove those other Apostles œcumenick Bishops; no more can they prove *Peter* to be such. That those Titles were given to others beside *Peter*, is proved by those following testimonies.

Paul in the *Galatians*, calls *James* and *John* Pillars, as well as *Peter*; whereby it appears, he makes them equal with *Peter*: *Eusebius Emissenus*, *Homilia in Natal.* Petri & Pauli, calls *Paul* and *Andrew* *Princes of the Apostles*. *Rufinus*, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 1. *hist.* calls *James* *Prince of the Apostles*. Chrysostom in *Galat.* 2. calls *Paul*, *Prince of the Apostles*. *Prudentius* calls *Peter* and *Paul* *Princes of the Apostles*. Last-

ly, those very Fathers who give those elegies to *Peter*; affirm, that the Church was built on all the Apostles, as well as *Peter*; and some of them expresly gives the chief of them (as head) (or *Caput*) to others beside *Peter*, as *Basilius*, which we mentioned before.

The second reason wherefore those titles (of *head*, or *Prince*) prove not any jurisdiction of *Peter* over the other Apostles, is very relevant, and is this (*viz.*) the principals of the Fathers expresly affirm, that *Peter* had no jurisdiction over the other Apostles. *Origenes*, *the Apostles were Kings*, and Christ, (not *Peter*) *King of Kings*. *Cyprianus* de unitate ecclesiæ, *Christ after his resurrection*, *gave a like power unto all the Apostles*: and a little after, *what ever* Peter *was*, *the other Apostles were the same*, *and had equal fellowship with him*, *both in honour and power*: *Chrysostomus*, in *Galat.* 2. Paul *needed not the testimony of* Peter; *he was equal to him in honour*, *I will say no more* whereby it is evident, in his opinion, *Paul* was more honourable then *Peter*. Likewayes, *Hom.* 66. in *Matth.* *None goeth before* Paul, *neither doth any doubt of it*. *Hieronymus*, *Galat.* 2. paraphrasing on *Pauls* words, saith, *I am nothing inferiour to* Peter, *we are both placed in the ministry by the same person*, (*viz.*) Christ. Likewayes, *lib.* 1. against *Jovinian*, *the Church is founded upon all the Apostles equally*, *all of them got the keys of the Kingdom of heaven alike*. Augustinus, *epist.* 86. Peter *and the other disciples lived in concord together*; where observe, *Peter* is called *condisciple* with the rest. *Gregorius* first Bishop of *Rome*, himself disputing against an œcumenick Bishop, *lib.* 4. *epist.* 32. amongst the other reasons, brings this for one, *although the care of the whole Church was committed to* Peter, *yet* Peter *was not œcumenick or universal Apostle*. Other testimonies might be heaped

heaped to this purpoſe, as of *Ambroſius*, in 1 *Cor.* 11. and *Gal.* 2. and likewayes of *Primaſius*, *Theophylactus*, and the ordinar Gloſſe, who all of them affirm the ſame upon *Gal.* 2.

And thus it is proved by two unanſwerable reaſons, that by thoſe titles of *Head and Prince*, *Peter* is not œcumenick Biſhop. Of that title of *head*, we ſpake before, that it was given unto others, as well as unto *Peter*, and now have proved the ſame of the title of *Prince*. If ye ask then, what is the meaning of thoſe expreſſions of the Fathers, calling *Peter Prince and Head of the Church or Apoſtles?* It is anſwered, the word *Head* or *Prince* may import a threefold Primacy, 1. of Juriſdiction, and in that ſenſe, none but Chriſt is called *head* or *prince* of the Church. 2. A primacy of Order without Juriſdiction, as when any of the ſame Colledge chooſeth one to be their Head, as Deacons chooſing an Arch-deacon, who hath only primacy of Order, and not of Juriſdiction 3. A primacy of gifts or graces; ſo the title *head* is taken 1 *Cor.* 12. ſo alſo *Paul* and *James*, &c. are called heads and Princes of the Apoſtles by the Fathers, as we ſaid before, becauſe they had eminent gifts. So *Homer* and *Virgilius* are called Princes of the Poets; *Cicero* and *Demoſthenes*, *Coriphæi oratorum*; and *Plato* and *Ariſtotle*, *Philoſophorum principes*. So *Nicodemus* was called Prince of the Jews, by *Cyrillus* and *Polycarpus*, Biſhop of *Smyrna*, Prince of *Aſia* by *Hieronymus*. The meaning of the Fathers then, giving to *Peter* thoſe titles of *head*, or *prince*, is not of the firſt ſort of primacy, as was demonſtrated; but only of the ſecond and third ſort of primacy, that is, by reaſon of his eminent gifts, in which others alſo excelled, as *Paul* and *John*, but eſpecially and cheifly becauſe he was eldeſt Apoſtle, and firſt called to that function: ſome think *Andrew* was called before him, but however, *Peter* had the priority of dignity; in what ſenſe,

it imports not much, so it was not priority of Jurisdiction: which that it was not, was now proved by unanswerable testimonies of the Fathers.

CHAP. XXI.

Some testimonies of Fathers, disproving the supremacy of Peter *vindicated.*

IN the former Chapters were answered, those testimonies of Fathers alleged by *Bellarmine*, to prove the supremacy of *Peter* over the Church, *cap.* 19. and over the other Apostles, *cap.* 20. in answering which testimonies, we proved, by opposing testimonies to testimonies, that the meaning of those Fathers was nothing lesse, then that *Peter* was Monarch of the Church, which we proved by two sort of testimonies; first, by those in which the same things were said of others beside *Peter*, by which they endeavoured to prove his supremacy, such as *head of the Church*, *prince of the Apostles*, &c. The second sort was of those, expresly denying that *Peter* had any superiority above the other Apostles, of which kind we alledged many. In this Chapter, we will vindicate the said testimonies from the exceptions of our Adversaries; and because their answers to them all, are almost the same with those which they make unto a certain passage of *Cyprian*, and an other of *Hieronymus*, we will vindicat both those passages from their sophistry, which are in effect two notable ones.

The first testimony is of *Cyprianus*, *de unitate ecclesiæ*, *Hoc erant utique & cæteri Apostoli*, *quod* Petrus, *pari consortio præditi*, *& honoris*, *& potestatis*: That is, *What ever* Peter *was*, *the other Apostles were the same*, *indued with alike fellowship of honour and power.*

This

This is a notable paſſage, in which *Cyprianus* is expreſly diſputing againſt the ſupremacy of *Peter*; for firſt, he affirms, all the Apoſtles were the ſame, which Peter was, and leaſt any ſhou'd think that his meaning is only, that they were all Apoſtles or fellows, he adds, *Pari conſortio*, they were of alike fellowſhip, ſince it might be objected, that inequality might be amongſt thoſe of the ſame fellowſhip; and our Adverſaries ordinarily diſtinguiſh between *order* and *juriſdiction*, as if the other Apoſtles were inferiour to Peter in *juriſdiction*, he adds, they were alike fellows *in honour and power*; that is, they had all alike *juriſdiction* with Peter. This place of *Cyprian* puts our Adverſaries to their witts end; they elude it two wayes, they who have any ſhame *by ſophiſtry*, others more impudente by *forgery*; we will examine their ſophiſtry in this Chapter, reſerving their forgery untill the laſt Chapter of the ſecond Book.

Pamelius objects, that the Book of *Manutius*, and of *Cambron* hath thoſe words of *Cyprian* otherwayes, *viz.* after the words of *Cyprian*, which we cited, follow thoſe, *Sed primatus* Petro *datur*, *ut una Eccleſia*, *& Cathedra una monſtretur*: That is, *But the primacy is given to* Peter, *that it might appear there is only one Church*, *and one Chair*.

But it is anſwered, albeit it might be defended, that thoſe words make not much for the ſupremacy of *Peter* in Juriſdiction, but only in dignity and order, it ſhall be demonſtrated, that *Manutius* added thoſe words to the text of *Cyprian*, by the command of Cardinal *Baronius*, againſt the Faith of all the ancient Copies of *Cyprian*, both printed and Manuſcripts, *lib. 2. cap. ult.*

Agricola his gloſſe, ſince it depends upon thoſe forged words, *Primatus* Petro *datur*, is not worth the anſwering: *Hayus*, "*Bozius*, *Turrianus* anſwer thus: Its true (ſay they) that the Apoſtles

" Apostles were all of a like power *before* Peter *was ordained* " *Monarch of the Church by Christ, viz.* before he said to him, " *tu es Petrus*, and this is the meaning of *Cyprian*; *Bozius* adds, " that this place of *Cyprian* expressly makes for the supre- " macy of *Peter*, because *Cyprian* affirms in the same place, " that the equality of the Apostles was taken away by " those words, *Pasce oves meas*; after which words that " equality of power ceased.

All this is sophistry, and first *Bozius* lyeth notoriously; *Cyprian* affirmeth no such thing, as that the equality of the Apostles ceased after those words, *Pasce oves meas*, since it is the mind of *Cyprian*, that the equality of the Apostles was, or consisted in feeding the flock of Christ; for he expressly affirms in the same place, that the equality of the Apostles was ordained after the resurrection; for immediatly before those words we cited, he affirmeth, *Christus Apostolus omnibus, post resurrectionem suam, parem potestatem tribuit*: and therefore, it is false that after those words, *Pasce oves meas*, the equality of the Apostles was taken away. *Bellarmine* useth another distinction, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 12. *viz.* that all the Apostles had alike authority over the Church; but they were not of alike authority amongst themselves. This is the answer also of *Costerus*, *encherid. cap.* 3.

But it is answered, this glosse of *Bellarmines* is very strange; first, how can *Peter* be œcumenick Bishop, if the other Apostles had alike Authority over the Church with him? for, the Bishop of *Rome* questionless will not affirm, that any other Bishop has as much Authority over the Church, as he hath. Secondly, though this distinction were granted, it takes not away the force of the testimony, for disparity of persons, doth not infer a disparity of Authority alike in them all, but only that the Authority is more eminent in dignity in some, then in others. Thirdly, whereas *Bellarmine* grants, that

that they were all alike Apoſtles, but the function of an Apoſtle is the higheſt degree in the Church; *Ergo*, if they were equal to him in the Apoſtleſhip, they were equal to him in the higheſt Eccleſiaſtical function. As for that diſtinction of *Bellarmines*, *That that equality of the Apoſtles with* Peter *was extraordinar, and not derived to their ſucceſſors as the Authority of* Peter, *who was ordinar Paſtor, and whoſe Authority was derived to his Succeſſors*; we proved before, that it was a fiction of *Bellarmines* own invention, not known to the Ancients.

Sanderus, *lib. 6. cap.* 4, of his Monarchy, hath another diſtinction, *viz.* that albeit all the Apoſtles were of equal Authority over Chriſtians, yet the Original of that Authority was from *Peter*, although as to the execution, it was alike in them all.

But it is anſwered firſt, this diſtinction is preſſed with the ſame difficulties, with which thoſe of *Bellarmines* was; it is a flat contradiction, to affirm any to be equal in the execution of that Authority, with thoſe from whom they have it: yea *Leo* B ſhop of *Rome* complained heavily, that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* was made equal to him as to the execution of it. This diſtinction of *Sanderus* leans on a falſe foundation, *viz. that the reſt of the Apoſtles had their Authority from* Peter: which expreſly contradicts *Cyprian*, who affirms, *they had it from* Chriſt, *and* Paul, 2. *Cor.* 5. profeſſeth, *he was an Ambaſſadour from Chriſt, or in the name of* Chriſt. And *Franciſcus de victoria* (as we ſhewed before) expreſly diſputs, *that all the Apoſtles had their Authority immediatly from Chriſt*; and taxeth the gloſſe on *Cyprian*, making uſe of this diſtinction of *Sanderus*, againſt the mind of *Cyprian*: However, it may be granted, that *Peter* was the firſt in Dignity, although the other Apoſtles were equal to him in Authority.

Stapleton, *lib. 6 cap.* 7. in *principis*, uſeth a threefold diſtinction, the firſt is, that all the Apoſtles were of alike p. w.

er as Apostles, but not as Bishops; But that distinction was exploded before, *cap.* 16. The second distinction is, *quo ad amplitudinem, rerum gerundarum, sed non quo ad superioritatem in ordine gerendi*: that is in effect the same distinction with that of *Bellarmine*, now mentioned, and therefore it needs no other answer, since it imports no other thing, then that the equality of the Apostles power was relative to the Church, but their inequality consisted in their relation to *Peter*. His third distinction is, that *Peter* had power of Government above the other Apostles: but according to the execution of that Power, all the Apostles were alike with him. But that distinction, is likewayes contradictiory, as we shewed before, and this much of *Cyprian*.

The second testimony, is of *Hieronymus*, *lib.* 1. in *Jovinianum, Vt dicis, super* Petrum *fundatur ecclesia: licet id ipsum alio loco, super omnes Apostolos fiat, & ex æquo super eos ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur: but you affirm, that the Church is founded upon* Peter, *although the same be done in another place upon all the Apostles*, viz. *that the Church is builded upon them all alike*; which gloss of *Hieronymus*, quite destroyes that argument of *Peters* Supremacy, *viz.* that he was the only Rock among all the Apostles, upon which the Church was builded.

Bellarmine answers, that *Hieronymus* explains himself in the same place, where he affirms, one was chosen among the twelve; that a head being constitute, occasion of Schism might be taken away, *&c.*

But it is replyed, *Cardinal Cajetanus* sees no such gloss in these words of *Hieronymus*, as we shewed before, *cap.* 10. where he affirms, that nothing peculiar was promised to *Peter*, in these words *tu es* Petrus, and proves it by this testimony of *Hieronymus*, that the Church was builded alike upon all the Apostles, and in what sence *Peter* is called head by *Hieronymus*,

Hieronymus, was ſhewed before, *cap.* 20. for it is certain, that *Hieronymus*, by calling *Peter* head of the twelve, doth not mean *Peter* had juriſdiction over the reſt; otherwayes he would expreſly contradict himſelf, in this ſame place; he calls him *head* therefore in the ſame ſenſe, that others are called heads, which we mentioned, *cap.* 20.

But *Bellarmine* inſtances, that *he was made head of the twelve, that ſchiſme might be takan away.* But it is replyed, that was before they were ſent by Chriſt to preach the Goſpel: but *Cyprian* and *Hieronymus* ſeems to be of that opinon, that *Peter* was head of the twelve, as the Apoſtles were a private Company or Congregation; but after the reſurrection, that authority ceaſed, when our Saviour commiſſionated them all alike to preach the Gospel through the world with equal authority.

And this much of that famous Diſpute of the ſupremacy of *Peter*, in which we have fiſhed all what is of any moment from that immenſe Ocean of Antiquity, either to aſſault it, or aſſert it; by which it appears, to any indifferent Reader, upon what a weak foundation the Faith of the Modern Church of *Rome* is built, *viz. the ſupremacy of* Peter, *or that* Peter *was œcumenick Biſhop*: which was a conceit that the Ancients did not dream of, before the fifth Age after the Council of *Chalcedon*, when that contention aroſe between the Biſhops of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople* for the primacy. Before the time of *Leo* firſt, the Biſhops of *Rome* and *Leo* himſelf pleaded a priority in dignity by Acts of Councils, but ſuccumbing in that, *Leo* was the firſt that deviſed *tu es Petrus* for the primacy, his ſucceſſours ſtill argumenting the force of that Argument, and uſed it afterwards for univerſal juriſdiction; whereas at firſt, it was objected only for *cura univerſalis eccleſiæ*. Now having abſolved that diſpute of *Peters* Monarchy, we will examine his Biſhoprick of *Rome*, which is the ſecond part of the Biſhoprick of *Peter*.

CHAP. XXII.

Bellarmines *Argument answered, Proving that* Peter *was at* Rome.

HItherto hath been disputed, *Whether* Peter *was instituted œcumenick Bishop by Christ*, which was the first assertion or ground, on which the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* is founded: Now followeth the second, which according to *Bellarmine*, *lib. 2. de pont. Rom.* is, *that* Peter *at the command of Christ fixed his seat at* Rome, *and did sit there as Bishop unto his death.* Here ariseth a two-fold question, first, *Whether* Peter *was at* Rome? next, *Whether he was Bishop of* Rome? if he was never at *Rome*, it is certain he was never Bishop of *Rome*; and albeit he had been at *Rome*, it doth not follow he was Bishop of *Rome*: it was commonly believed, that *Peter* was at *Rome*, and Bishop of *Rome*, before the time of *Marcilius Patavinus*, who lived in the 14. Age, and wrote a Book, intituled, *Defensor Pacis*, in which he maintains *Peter* was never at *Rome*, nor Bishop of *Rome*, and proves, that all the Ancients were deceived, who affirmed either the one or the other: his reasons shall be mentioned in the following Chapters; in this are answered the reasons of *Bellarmine*, proving the first, that he was at *Rome*.

The assertion of *Bellarmine* was, *that* Peter *was Bishop of* Rome *by ordination of Christ*; to prove which, he brings nothing, but falls to prove that *Peter* was first at *Rome*, and next that he was Bishop of *Rome*, and instead of Christs institution, he brings nothing but *conjectures of the Ancients*, to prove that *Peter* was at *Rome*, and *perverted testimonies* to prove that he was Bishop of *Rome*. It was shewed before, that all the Faith and Doctrine of the modern Church of *Rome*, depended upon the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, which

which supremacy consisted in three assertions; first, that *Peter* was *œcumenick Bishop* by divine institution, which makes nothing for the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, without the other two, *viz.* that *Peter* by divine institution was *Bishop* of *Rome*, and that the Bishop of *Rome* succeeded to *Peter* by divine institution in the Monarchy of the Church; any of those two being brangled, the whole foundation of the modern Roman Religion is quite destroyed. *Bellarmine*, to prove both the one and the other (after he had undertaken to prove them by divine institution) brings nothing but conjectures involved with contradictions, and consequently the whole Edifice of the Church of *Rome* is builded upon such conjectures. The succession of the Bishop of *Rome* to *Peter*, shall be disputed in the following Books: in this Chapter are answered those reasons, proving that *Peter* was at *Rome*; in the next shall be answered, those reasons proving *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, and then we will conclude this Book with those reasons of *Marcilius Petavinus* and *Ulrichus Velenus*, proving that *Peter*, was neither at *Rome*, nor Bishop of *Rome*.

Bellarmines first reason to prove that *Peter* was at *Rome*, is from 1 *Pet.* 5. 13. *The Church which is at Babylon salutes you*, &c. *This was the Church* (saith *Bellarmine*) *in which* Peter *remained when he wrote this Epistle*, viz. Babylon, *which in the Scripture many times signifies* Rome; *and therefore* Peter *by* Babylon *means* Rome, *and consequently* Peter *was at* Rome.

But it is answered, albeit in the *Apocalyps*, which is a mystical Prophesie, *Rome* be meant by *Babylon*, yet we do not find in Scripture in any Epistle, that *Rome* was called *Babylon*: it would be a ridiculous expression to conclude an Epistle written at *Rome* from *Babylon*. The Apostle *Paul* in all his Epistles written at *Rome*, never concludes from *Babylon*, but

from *Rome*, and therefore *Peter* in this Epistle understands not *Rome*, but *Babylon*. It is to be observed, there were two Cities called *Babylon*; the first *Babylon* in *Assyria*, which was the head of the Babylonish Empire; the other *Babylon* was in *Egypt*, and afterwards was called *Cayre*: *Peter* by *Babylon* means either the one or the other, more probably the first, because it appears by History, that many Jews remained there, and *Peter* was the Apostle of the Jews, as *Paul* was of the Gentiles.

Bellarmine objects, that *Irenæus*, *Justinus* and *Tertullianus*, *expone that* Babylon *mentioned by* Peter *to be* Rome.

But it is answered, those Fathers follow the authority of *Papias*, believed to be the Disciple of *John*, as *Bellarmine* affirms, he was followed by *Irenæus*, who in *Eusebius*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 39. affirms, that the said *Papias* and *Polycarpus* were auditors of the Apostle *John*; but *Eusebius* in the said place confutes that opinion, by the authority of *Papias* himself, who denyed that ever he had seen the Apostles with his eyes; *Eusebius* adds, that he was a man of *no spirit* and the Author not only of the *Millinarii*, but also of other fabulous traditions: and so in the opinion of *Eusebius*, the authority of *Papias* is not much to be regarded. And since the whole foundation of the Church of *Rome*, depends upon the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*; and since the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, depends upon *Peters* being at *Rome*; and since *Peters* being at *Rome*, depends upon the testimonies of some Fathers, following the Authority of *Papias*; it may be concluded without sophistry, that the whole Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* depends upon the said *Papias*: what sort of man he was, we have now shewed from *Eusebius*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 39.

Bellarmines second Argument, to prove that *Peter* was at *Rome*, is this, *There were Christians at* Rome, *before ever* Paul *came to* Rome, *Ergo* Peter *was at* Rome: and here he endeavours

vours to prove by many testimonies, that *Peter* was the first that preached the Gospel at *Rome*, but to no purpose, since those testimonies are of no more force to prove that *Peter* was at *Rome*, then those he alledged in the former Argument. That they are false, appears by *Orosius*, *lib.* 7. *cap.* 4. who affirms, that Christians were at *Rome* in the time of *Tiberius*, but *Peter* came not to *Rome*, till after the death of *Tiberius*, that is, the second year of *Claudius*, as *Bellarmine* himself confesseth.

Bellarmine answers, *That* Orosius *doth not affirm, that Christians were at* Rome *in the time of* Tiberius, *but only that the Senate of* Rome *made a decree, that they should not come to* Rome; *which is the true meaning of* Orosius.

But it is replyed, *Orosius* expresly affirms, that *Tiberius* made a motion to the Senat of *Rome*, that Christ should be acknowledged as a God; but the Senat refusing, set forth an Edict, that Christians should be exterminated or extruded the City of *Rome*, which imports that Christians were at *Rome*; which is confirmed by *Eusebius*, in his *Chronicles*, an. 38. who saith, *the Senat eliminated Christians from the City*; but *eliminating* is properly to put them out, that were in already. Likewayes, both *Eusebius* in the said place, and *Tertullianus*, *Apol. cap.* 5. affirm, that *Tiberius* threatned death to the Accusers of Christians at *Rome*, whereby it evidently appears that Christians were at *Rome*. Likewayes, *Platina* in the life of Christ, affirms expresly, that the Senate ordained Christians to be put forth of the City: likewayes, *Clement* in his first book of *Recognitions*, affirms, that *Barnabas* was at *Rome* in the time of *Tiberius*.

Bellarmine answers to this last objection, *That those Books of* Clement *are Apocryphal.* But it is replyed, when they fetch testimonies from this Book to prove any of their Tenets, they call it authentick; So *Coccius* and others. But when

they

they are pressed with testimonies from it, they call it Apocryphal.

Bellarmines third reason, to prove that *Peter* was at *Rome*, is, *That several of the Fathers affirm, that* Mark *wrote his Evangel at* Rome, *as he heard* Peter *preach it there.*

But it is answered, that all this depends upon the Authority of *Papias*, neither do they agree amongst themselves in the relation; for, *Hieronymus* following the authority of *Papias*, whom *Eusebius* called *an Impostor* (as we said before) affirms, that *Mark* wrote the said Evangel when *Peter* was alive, and that the said *Mark* died the eigth year of *Nero*: but *Irenæus* affirms, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 1. that *Mark* wrote his Evangel, after the death of *Peter* and *Paul*.

Bellarmines fourth reason, to prove that *Peter* was at *Rome* is, *that his Sepulchre is at* Rome, which he proves by the testimony of many Fathers. But it is answered, they were all deceived by *Papias*; Secondly, those Fathers who affirm, that *Peter* dyed at *Rome*, relate some circumstances of his death, which seem incredible; as first, they affirm, *that* Peter *and* Paul *died in one day*; but that seems incredible, because *Paul* came to *Rome* about the third and fourth year of *Nero*, he professeth that he was then old: They likewayes affirm, that he died the fourteenth year of *Nero*, and so he lived ten years after he called himself old: But this seems not to consist with that assertion, of his dying in one day with *Peter*; for, it is scarce credible, that *Peter* could be alive ten years after *Paul* called himself an old man, since *Paul* was very young when he was converted; but it appears by *John* 21. 18. that *Peter* was an old man before *Paul* was converted, that is, when Christ was alive; but *Paul* was not converted untill a year after the death of Christ, and therefore it seems incredible, that *Peter* could live ten years after *Paul* called himself an old man. The second incredible circumstance is, that they affirm, *that* Peter a

little

little before his death, having an intention to leave Rome, *Chriſt appeared to him in the Port of the City, and deſired him to return:* but the Scripture affirms, *that the Heavens ſhall contain Chriſt untill the laſt day*; and *Peter* himſelf affirms, *that Chriſt ſhall not deſcend from Heaven till then.* And whereas *Bellarmine* objects, that Chriſt appeared to *Paul* in the air, he ſpeaks ſo without any ground, becauſe *Act.* 9. it is only affirmed, *that a great light ſhined round about* Paul, *and that he heard a voice*; but the Scripture there doth not affirm, *that Chriſt was in the air*; *Paul* might have ſeen Chriſt as *Stephen* did, in heaven, himſelf being upon earth, *Act.* 7. 55. And thoſe are the reaſons by which *Bellarmine* proves *Peter* was at *Rome*, which all are founded upon conjectures. And ſince the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome* is founded upon the ſupremacy of *Peter*, and that *Peter* was at *Rome*; and ſince *Peters* being at *Rome* is founded upon contradictory conjectures (as partly we have ſhewed, and partly ſhall ſhew hereafter, minuting the reaſons of *Velenus*) by conſequence, the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome* is founded upon contradictory conjectures.

CHAP. XXIII.

Bellarmines *reaſons proving, that* Peter *was Biſhop of* Rome, *anſwered.*

IN the next place, *Bellarmine* endeavours to prove, that *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome*, and therefore he behoved to be at *Rome*: and his firſt reaſon is, *That the Church of* Rome *was ever held the firſt Church, but there can be no other reaſon why it was held ſo, but only that* Peter *was Biſhop.*

But it is anſwered, firſt, that *Rome* was held the firſt Church of old, not in power, but in dignity, becauſe *Rome* was the chief imperial City, as appears expreſly by the third

Canon

Canon of the second general Council at *Constantinople*, the 28. Canon of the fourth general Council of *Calcedon*, the 36. Canon of the sixth general Council of *Constantinople*, of which hereafter, *part.* 2 *lib* 1. and 2. Secondly, if respect be had to other reasons, besides the imperial dignity of the City, it is false that *Rome* was held for the first Church, as appears by many testimonies, first, *Theodoretus, lib.* 5. *cap.* 9. affirms, that the second general Council at *Constantinople*, in an Epistle to *Damasus* Bishop of *Rome* and the Bishops of the West, calls the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Mother of all Churches.* Secondly, *Nazianzenus*, *epist.* 18. affirms, *that the Church of* Cæsaria *was from the beginning: and was esteemed almost the Mother of all Churches.* Thirdly, *Basilius*, *Epist.* 20. to *Athanasius*, affirms, *That the Church of* Antioch *was head of all Churches.* The same is affirmed by *Chrysostomus* in several places, as in his Homile of the praises of *Ignatius*, and in his third Homile to the people of *Antioch*: by which testimonies it is evident, that *Rome* was called *the first Church* for a civil respect only, and that in other respects, other Churches were preferred to it.

Bellarmines second Argument is this, *The Hereticks cannot shew* (saith he) *where* Peter *was Bishop after he left* Antioch, *if he was not Bishop of* Rome, *since they affirm he was Bishop only of a particular Church, and not of the universal* Church.

But it is answered, *Bellarmine* may well confirm his Disciples by such reasoning, but he will never convert Hereticks by it: It is false which he affirms, that the Protestants maintain that *Peter* behoved of necessity to be Bishop of one particular Church or other; they deny he was Bishop of any particular Church at all, as shall immediatly appear; and therefore, it is ridiculous in *Bellarmine* to conclude, that *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, because they cannot instruct where he was Bishop elsewhere, when he left *Antioch*: they ask him

him again, how *Bellarmine* proves that he was Bishop of *Antioch*? they ask him also, where he was Bishop before he was Bishop of *Antioch*? for *Bellarmines* Argument presuppones, that *Peter* of necessity was still Bishop of one place or other.

Bellarmines third reason, to prove that *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, is taken from the testimony of Fathers, affirming, *he was Bishop there twenty five years:* As for those 25. years, they shall be proved false in the following Chapter: In this we will answer and explain the testimonies of those Fathers, affirming *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*; because in effect they are the only *Basis* of the Popes supremacy, we will examine them more diligently, and make it appear, that they are so many testimonies, proving *Peter* was never Bishop of the particular Church of *Rome*.

It is answered, to those testimonies of *Eusebius*, *Optatus*, *Ambrosius*, *Hieronymus*, *Sulpitius*, *Isidorus*, *Irenaus*, *Epiphanius*, &c. affirming *Peter* to be Bishop of *Rome*, that the word *Bishop* is taken two wayes; first, for a function of governing the Church in general, so *Peter* calles Christ *The Bishop of our souls*, *epist.* 1. *cap.* 2. so an Apostleship is called *Bishoprick*, *Act.* 2. Secondly, *Bishop* is taken in a stricter sense, for a certain function Ecclesiastick, inferiour unto the Apostolick function; so it is taken by *Paul*, 1 *Tim. cap.* 3. *If any desire a Bishoprick:* in which last sense we now take it, and so answers those testimonies of *Bellarmine*, by which he proves that *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, that those Fathers take *Bishop in the first sense*, and their meaning is no other then that *Peter* as an Apostle, taught at *Rome* twenty five years. That this is no shift or evasion, is demonstrated by these three following reasons.

The first reason is, that the Fathers reckoning the successions of the Bishops of *Rome*, put *Paul* with *Peter* in the

first place, whereby it is evident, that those Fathers take the word *Bishop* in the first sense, comprehending the Apostleship; since none of them, nor *Bellarmine* himself, will affirm, that *Paul* was Bishop of *Rome* in the second sense. That this is the truth, *viz.* that *Paul* is named *first Bishop of Rome* with *Peter*, appears by those following testimonies.

First of *Irenæus, lib. 3. cap. 3. Fundantes igitur & instruentes beati Apostoli* (Petrus & Paulus) Lino *Episcopatum administrandæ ecclesiæ tradiderunt*: *The blessed Apostles* (Peter *and* Paul) *when they founded the Church of* Rome, *they made* Linus *Bishop.*

The second testimony is of *Epiphanius, heres.* 27. *Episcoporum in* Roma *successio hanc consequantiam habuit* Petrus & Paulus, Linus, Cletus: *The succession of the Bishops of* Rome *was this,* Peter *and* Paul, Linus, Cletus.

The third testimony is of *Eusebius, hist. lib. 3. cap. 2. post* Petri & Pauli *Martyrium primus* Romanæ *Ecclesiæ Episcopatum* Linus *sortito capit*: *After the martyrdom of* Peter *and* Paul, Linus *had the Bishoprick of* Rome *to his charge.*

Such-like other testimonies ye may have of *Augustinus, epist. 65.* of *Optatus, lib. 2.* of *Tertullianus*, who all put *Peter* and *Paul* joyntly in the first place; whence it is, that in the Bulls of the Popes, the Images of *Paul* and *Peter* are joyntly expressed in the Seals, where the Image *Paul* hath the right hand, and many wondered why? but the reason is, because *Paul* was preferred to *Peter*, in the fundation of the Church of *Rome*, as being a Church of Gentiles under the Apostleship of *Paul*, and not of *Peter*, whose Apostleship was extended no further then to the Jews. However, since *Paul* and *Peter* joyntly are reckoned first Bishops of *Rome*, it is evident, that (*Bishop*) is taken in the first sense, as it comprehends *an Apostle.*

The

The ſecond reaſon is, becauſe Fathers enumerating the Catalogue of the Biſhops of *Rome*, do it in manner following.

PETER and *PAUL*.

1. *Linus*.	7. *Teleſphorus*.
2. *Cletus*.	8. *Hyginus*.
3. *Clemens*.	9. *Pius*.
4. *Enariſtus*.	10. *Anicetus*.
5. *Alexander*.	11. *Soter*.
6. *Sixtus*.	12. *Eliutherius*, &c.

WHere they do not reckon *Peter* and *Paul* among the Biſhops, but only reckons the Biſhops from them as their founders, putting *Linus* as firſt Biſhop, *Cletus* as ſecond, *Clemens* as third; whereas if *Peter* and *Paul* had been Biſhops, *Linus* had been ſecond, *Cletus* third, *Clemens* fourth, *&c.* That they reckon them ſo, appears by theſe following teſtimonies, Firſt of *Irenæus*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. who calls *Clement* the third Biſhop, *Sixtus* the ſixth, *Eliutherius* the twelfth: but if he had reckoned *Peter* as firſt Biſhop, then *Clemens* had been the fourth, *Sixtus* the ſeventh, *Eliutherius* thirteenth.

The ſecond teſtimony is of *Euſebius*, *hiſt. lib.* 3. *cap.* 2. where he calls *Linus* firſt Biſhop; and likewayes, *cap.* 4. where he calls *Clemens* third Biſhop: and *cap* 16. where he calls *Clemens* third Biſhop, *Linus* firſt Biſhop, *Cletus* ſecond Biſhop; and *lib.* 4. *cap.* 1. he calls *Enariſtus* fourth Biſhop, and *cap.* 5. he calls *Teleſphorus* ſeventh Biſhop: likewayes in his Chronicles, he gives unto them the ſame order of ſucceſſion, *anno.* 69. and 81. and 93. and 100. where-

by it is evident by *Eusebius*, that *Peter* was not Bishop of *Rome*, since he gives ranks to the other Bishops, as if *Linus* had been first Bishop.

The third testimony is of *Gregorius*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 27. who reckons the order of succession of the Bishops of *Rome*, as *Linus* were first Bishop, and not *Peter*; for he calls *Clement* the third Bishop of *Rome*; but if he had included *Peter* in the Catalouge of the Bishops, *Clement* had been the fourth Bishop in his calculation.

Some Romanists answer, that those testimonies do not prove *Linus* was first Bishop, *Cletus* second, *Clemens* third, absolutely, but only that the meaning of those Fathers is, that *Linus* was the first Bishop after *Peter*, *Cletus* the second, *Clemens* the third; which is as much as if those Fathers had said, *Peter* was first, *Linus* second, *Cletus* third, *Clemens* fourth.

But it is replyed, that is but a shift or evasion, because it appears to any who is versed in *Eusebius*, that when he speaks so, *First Bishop* after such an one, If that *one* in his opinion be a Bishop himself, he includes him in the number, and makes him first Bishop, as appears by his Catalogue of the Bishops of *Alexandria*, where he calls *Cerdo* the third Bishop after *Anianus*, but he calls *Anianus first Bishop*, *lib.* 12. *cap.* 3. So, *cap.* 16. he reckons *Anianus* first, *Abilius* second, *Cerdo* third; whereby it is evident, that when he speaks so, *viz. third Bishop after such an one*, That he evermore includes that *one* in the number, when he thinks he is a Bishop, as is evident by his reckoning of the Bishops of *Alexandria*, *Cerdo* (saith he) *was third after* Anianus; That is, *Anianus* was first, *Abilius* second, *Cerdo* third: But in the Catalogue of the Bishops of *Rome*, when he calls *Linus* the first after *Peter*, *Cletus* the second, *Clemens* the third, he includes not *Peter* in the Catalogue, but reckons them as

Peter

Peter were not Bishop at all, other wayes he would call *Peter* first Bishop of *Rome*, as he did *Anianus* first Bishop of *Alexandria*.

The third reason proving those Fathers calling *Peter* Bishop of *Rome*, takes the word Bishop largely, and not strictly, and properly is unanswerable, because it appears by their own testimonies, and likewayes of other Fathers, that *Linus* and *Cletus*, were Bishops of *Rome* when *Peter* was alive; whereby it is evident, that *Peter* was called Bishop of *Rome*, only because he and *Paul* founded that Church (in the opinion of those Fathers) for *Peter* could not be Bishop of *Rome* properly, if *Linus* was Bishop of *Rome* when *Peter* was alive: but that *Linus* and *Cletus* were Bishops of *Rome* when *Paul* was alive, is proved by these following testimonies.

The first testimony is of *Tertullianus*, *lib. de præscrip. cap.* 32. (according to the distinction of *Pamelius*) where he affirms, that *Polycarpus* was ordained Bishop of *Smyrna* by *John* the Apostle, and in the same manner, *Clemens* was ordained Bishop of *Rome* by *Peter*: but it is notorious, that *John* was alive when he ordained *Polycarpus* Bishop of *Smyrna*, neither was *John* Bishop of *Smyrna* himself; therefore it follows, that *Clemens* being ordained Bishop of *Rome* by *Peter*, that he was Bishop of *Rome* when *Peter* was alive, since *Polycarpus* was Bishop of *Smyrna* when *John* was alive.

The second testimony is of *Irenæus*, and is this, in *Eusebius*, *lib.* 5 *hist. cap.* 6. where *Eusebius* brings in *Irenæus* speaking thus, *The blessed Apostles* [Paul *and* Peter] *founding the Church of* Rome, *gave unto* Linus *the Bishoprick of the Administration of that Church*: whereby it is notorious, that the function of *Peter* and *Paul* was different from the function of Bishop (in the strict and proper sense) and likewayes, it

is

is evident by the words, that while they were alive, they did put *Linus* in the actual possession of the Bishoprick of *Rome*.

Bellarmine answers, that *Peter* did put *Linus* and *Cletus in the Church of* Rome, *when he was alive, not as Bishops, but as Coadjutors unto him, especially* Peter *being oftimes called elsewhere by his Apostolick function*: But he intangles himself foully; first, he makes *Peter* sufficient to govern the whole Church, as elsewhere he affirmeth, and yet in this answer, he makes him insufficient to govern the Church of *Rome* without a Coadjutor. 2. *Irenæus* affirms, that *Paul* ordained *Linus* Bishop of *Rome*, as well as *Peter*; and if *Linus* had been Coadjutor to those who ordained him, he would have been Coadjutor to *Paul* as well as to *Peter*, and consequently, *Paul* was also Bishop of *Rome*. 3. *Irenæus* expresly distinguisheth the Office of an Apostle from that of a Bishop, in these words, for he affirmeth, Peter *and* Paul *founded the Church of* Rome, *and gave the Bishoprick thereof to* Linus: So *Epiphanius*, heræsie 27. affirms, *that the Office of an Apostle was not tyed to one place, and therefore in their absence*, Rome *could not be without a Bishop*.

The third Testimony is of *Ruffinus*, in his preface to those Books of *Recognitions* attributed to *Clement*; his words are these, Linus *and* Cletus *were Bishops of* Rome, *before* Clement, *but while* Peter *was alive, to wit, that they might be Bishops, and himself might fulfill the office of an Apostle*: in which words, *Ruffinus* expresly calls *Linus* and *Cletus* Bishops of *Rome*, having a distinct Office from that of *Peter*; whereby it evidently appears, that *Peter* was not Bishop of *Rome* in the strict sense mentioned before; which is further confirmed by the next following words of *Ruffinus*, wherein he affirms, *that* Zacheus *was in the same manner ordained by* Peter Bishop

at

at Cæsaria, *as* Linus *and* Cletus *were at* Rome. But *Bellarmine* will not affirm, that *Peter* was Bishop of *Cæsaria*, and *Zacheus* his Coadjutor; and although this testimony of *Ruffinus* doth not convince *Barronius*, yet *Onufrius*, *Sanderus*, *Feuardentius*, confesse ingenuously, that it can hardly be shunned. *Barronius* gives no regard to the testimony of *Ruffinus*, because he interprets that sixth Canon of the Council of *Neice* against the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*; but since *Ruffinus* lived very near that time, and since he is seconded by all the ancient Interpreters (as shall appear in the following Book, who all interpret that Act against the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, as well as he, though in a different manner) his authority is more to be regarded then that of *Bellarmine*, or *Barronius*, devising a new interpretation of the said Act 1300. years after the date of it, against the currant of all Antiquity, as shall be shewed, *lib. 2. cap.*

CHAP. XXIV.

Presumptions that Peter *was never at* Rome, *and demonstrations that he was never* Bishop *of* Rome.

IN the two preceding Chapters has been answered those reasons alledged by *Bellarmine*, to prove that *Peter* was at *Rome*, and Bishop of *Rome*; by which it appears, upon what weak reasons the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* is built, and which is quite destroyed, if neither of these be true: The weaknesse of *Bellarmines* grounds will further appear, in this present Chapter, in which are mentioned some strong presumptions, that *Peter* was never at *Rome*, and invincible demonstrations that *Peter* was never Bishop of *Rome*, if the word *Bishop* be taken in the proper and strict sense which we mentioned before. That *Peter* was never at *Rome*, may be perswaded by the following reasons,

First

First, those Fathers affirming *Peter* was at *Rome*, agree all that he was twenty five years Bishop there; and yet, some of them affirms, that he came to *Rome* in the second year of *Claudius*, so *Hieronymus*, in *Catolog* some of them in the fourth year of *Claudius*, so *Fasciculus temporum*, following *Marianus*, *Scotus*: *Beda* also on *Acts* 13. affirms the same; and also *Waldensis*, *tom.* 1. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 7. some of them affirms that he came to *Rome*, *anno* 13. of *Claudius* so the Book called *Passionale de vitis sanctorum*: some of them that he came not to *Rome* untill a little before his death, so *Origines*, *tom.* 3. *ingenes.* which behoved to be in the latter end of *Nero*; *Damasus* also, *in Pontificali* affirms, he came to *Rome* under *Nero*: *Thomas Aquinas*, in *Gallat.* 2. *lect.* 1. affirms, he came to *Rome* in the 14. year after *Pauls* conversion, which was 18 years after the passion of Christ, who suffered in the 18. year of *Tiberius*, who reigned twenty two years: *Caligula* almost four; therefore, according to *Thomas*, *Peter* came to *Rome* in the sixth or seventh year of *Claudius*; but many of those foresaid Authors affirm, that *Peter did sit* 25 years at *Rome*, which is a manifest contradiction since, they all agree almost, that he died in the last year of *Nero*.

Bellarmine answers, *Its certain that Christ died, and yet learned men vary about the time.* But it is replyed, that the certainty of Christs death is had from Scripture, and not from those who vary about the time of it; but the certainty of *Peters* being at *Rome* is had no where, but from those who vary about the time of his coming there; and since they contradict other in the last, they merit no credit in the first.

Bellarmine answers, secondly, *that no approved Authors varies in the time, but only some bastard Authors such, as* Fasciculus temporum &c. But it is replyed, that *Bellarmine* will not affirm, that *Origines*, *Marianus*, *Scotus*, *Beda*, *Damasus*, are bastard Authors; but it is proved that all those vary.

The

The ſecond perſwaſion that *Peter* was never at *Rome* is this, they who affirm, *Peter* went to *Rome* in the ſecond year of *Claudius*; ſo *Hieronymus*, *Euſebius* and others affirm, it was to defeat *Simon Magus*, who died in the laſt year of *Nero*, that is, twenty five years after the ſecond year of *Claudius*, and for whoſe death, *Peter* alſo himſelf was put to death by *Nero*: but ſince *Peter* went a purpoſe to *Rome* to deſtroy *Simon Magus*, it is a thing incredible, that he could not do it in leſſe then twenty five years; yea, *Bellarmine* himſelf affirms, that *Peter* after he had ſtayed ſeven years at *Rome* came back to *Jeruſalem*: but this is more incredible, that *Peter* would go to *Rome* to overcome *Simon Magus*, ſtay there ſeven years, and come back without doing any thing, and ſuffer *Simon Magus* to live eighteen years after.

The third reaſon why *Peter* was not at *Rome*, is this, they who ſo affirm, maintain alſo, that *Peter* went to *Antioch* five years after the paſſion of Chriſt, was ſeven years Biſhop there, and then went to *Rome*, where he was Biſhop twenty five years: but it appears by *Galat.* 1. and 2. *Acts* 12. and 15. that *Peter* for the moſt part was at *Jeruſalem*, at leaſt to the eighteenth year after Chriſts paſſion; but according to the Calculation of thoſe Authors, *Peter* had been ſeven years at *Rome*, in the eighteenth year of Chriſts paſſion, and conſequently, he could not be at *Rome*, and at the Council of *Jeruſalem*, in the eighteenth year after Chriſts paſſion.

Bellarmine anſwers, *that* Peter *in the ſeventh year of his* Biſhoprick *was expelled* Rome, *becauſe* Acts 18. *it is mentioned, that* Claudius *expelled the Jews from* Rome, *and came back to* Jeruſalem *that year of the Council, from whence he returned back to* Rome *and died there.*

But it is replyed, he involves himſelf in a world of abſurdities; firſt, in affirming *Peter* was expelled *Rome* by

Claudius, when he made that Edict against the Jews; because if *Peter* had been expelled by that Edict, it behoved of necessity to be some considerable time before the Council of *Jerusalem*, since *Peter* being expelled by that Edict, was present at the Council of *Jerusalem*; but *Paul* and *Barnabas* (as is affirmed by *Luke*) after that Council, stayed some time at *Antiochia*, and then *Paul* journyed to *Syria* and *Cilicia*, then he came to *Derbas* and *Lystra*; after that, having gone thorow *Phrygia*, *Galatia*, *Mycia*, he came to *Troas*, and thence to *Macedonia*, where he was imprisoned at *Philippi*; Thence passing thorow *Amphipolis* and *Apolonia*, he came to *Thessalonica*, from thence to *Berea*, from thence to *Athens*, Acts 15. 16. and 17. After all those journeys, he arived at *Corinth*, where he did find *Aquila* and *Priscilla*, who were now come out of *Italy*, by reason of that Edict of *Claudius*; whence it appears, that *Bellarmine* affirms falsly, that *Peter* was expelled *Rome* by reason of that Edict of *Claudius*, since when *Paul* found *Priscilla* and *Aquila* at *Corinth*, it behoved to be some years after *Peter* was expelled *Rome*, considering *Peters* journey from *Rome* to *Jerusalem* before the Council, *Pauls* tedious journeys after the Council, before he met with *Priscilla* and *Aquila*, who were new come out of *Rome* by reason of that Edict of *Claudius* (or as the Syrian Interpreter) were expelled *Rome* at the same time, by that Edict of *Claudius*: So it is impossible, that *Peter* so long time before could have been expelled by the same Edict.

Secondly, *Bellarmine* himself confesseth, *lib. 2. cap 6. de pont. Rom.*, *that* Peter *had left a dangerous example to posterity, if he had retained two Bishopricks at one time.* But its no less pernitious example to leave their particular Charge, as *Bellarmine* affirms, *Peter* did; neither is it of any moment to affirm, that he was forced to leave it by that Edict of *Claudius*, since *Peter* should rather have suffered, then obeyed

obeyed that Edict: Secondly, becauſe as *Bellarmine* affirms, when he was Biſhop of *Antiochia*, he wandered up and down, leaving his Charge. Thirdly, it ſeems very abſurd which *Bellarmine* affirms, *that* Peter *in one year was Biſhop of* Antioch, *impriſoned at* Jeruſalem, *and* Biſhop *of* Rome.

Fourthly, if *Peter* had been Biſhop of *Rome*, in the time of the Council of *Jeruſalem*, he would not at that very Council, made that paction with *Paul*; taking upon himſelf to be Apoſtle of the Jewes, and leaving it to *Paul* to be Apoſtle of the Gentiles, among which his own Biſhoprick of *Rome* was.

Fifthly, it is not credible, that *Peter* ſhould have been fourteen years (at the time of the Council at *Jeruſalem*) partly Biſhop of *Antioch*, partly of *Rome*, a Church for the moſt part of Gentiles, and yet to compell the ſaid Gentiles to judaize as *Peter* did.

The fourth reaſon that *Peter* was never at *Rome*, is this, that *Paul* in his Epiſtle to the Romans, ſalutes many, *cap.* 16. but he makes no mention of *Peter* at all; but it is incredible he would have ſaluted ſo many, and ommitted the ſalutation of *Peter*, who was Biſhop of the place.

Bellarmine anſwers, *That he did not ſalute* John *in his Epiſtle to the* Epheſians, *nor* James *in his Epiſtle to the* Hebrews; *and yet* John *was Biſhop of* Epheſus, *and* James *Biſhop of* Jeruſalem.

But it is replyed, this anſwer of *Bellarmine* is very childiſh, for to omit that neither *John* nor *James* were Biſhops at all, but only Apoſtles and founders of thoſe Churches, as we ſaid before, *John* was not at *Epheſus* at that time, nor ſtayed there, and *James* at that time was dead; neither did *Paul* write his Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, to the particular Church of *Jeruſalem*, but to the whole Jews.

Bellarmine anſwers, ſecondly, *That* Peter *was not returned to* Rome, *when* Paul *wrote his Epiſtle to the* Romans. But it is replyed, firſt, *Aquila* and *Priſcilla* were returned to

Rome, whom *Bellarmine* affirms were expelled at the same time with *Peter*, whom *Paul* salutes, *Rom.* 16. 3. but it is incredible, that *Peter* who was Bishop of the place, would not have returned with the first. Secondly, *Paul* among the causes of his thanksgiving for the Faith of the Romans, *cap.* 1. 8. and other praises, *cap.* 16. or of his own prayers, *cap.* 16. 10. makes no mention of *Peter* at all; yet constantly in his Epistles, he useth to mention the Ministers of the Churches to which they are directed, whether they be present or not, as appears by 1. *Corinth. cap.* 16. 15. *Ephes.* 6. 21. *Phil.* 2. 19. *Col.* 4. 9. 12. *&c.*

The fifth reason that *Peter* was never at *Rome* is, it is known that *Paul* wrote several Epistles from *Rome*, in the time of *Nero*, in whose time *Bellarmine* affirms, that *Peter* was at *Rome*; in which Epistles, he makes frequent mention of others of lesser note; and yet he makes no mention of *Peter* at all, as *Col.* 4. 11. and 2. *Timothy*, 4. 16.

Bellarmine answers, first, *that a negative testimony proves nothing; it doth not follow* Peter *was not at* Rome, *because* Paul *makes no mention of him.*

But it is replyed, it is not only a negative testimony, which is the ground of the Argument; but an Argument *à minore ad majus*; *Paul* makes mention of others of lesser note: much more he would have made mention of *Peter*, if he had been at *Rome*. 2. There are two sorts of negative testimonies, the first is, purely *negative*; the second is *privative*, when nothing is testified when it should have been testified: this last sort of negative Argument is most efficacious, as is acknowledged by *Medina* upon *Thomas*, *part.* 83. *quæst.* 1. *art.* 3. Neither can it be denyed that this is good reasoning, There was but one World created, That only the second person of the Trinity assumed flesh, because the Scripture makes no mention, that more Worlds were created, or that the other persons of the Trinity were incarnate. But this Argument is taken from a

privative

privative teſtimony, *viz.* *Paul* could not, without juſt reprehenſion, make no mention of *Peter*, if *Peter* had been at *Rome* at that time, as appears by *Coloſ.* 4. 10, 11. where *Paul* affirms, that *Marcus*, *Juſtus* and *Ariſtarchus*, were all the Jews which were his work-fellows in the Goſpel: But if *Peter* had been at *Rome*, *Paul* had ſpoken untruly in excluding him from being one of his work-fellows, which he reſtricts to the following three: for, if *Peter* had been at *Rome*, *Paul* would never have affirmed, that thoſe three were the only work-fellows he had at *Rome*. Again, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10, 11. he affirms, that all his fellows had forſaken him, except *Luke*, who only was with him: but if *Peter* had been at *Rome*, he would never have forſaken *Paul*, nor had it been true which *Paul* affirmed, that none were with him but *Luke*.

Thoſe paſſages puzleth *Bellarmine* very ſore, as appears by his perplexed anſwer he gives to that paſſage of *Coloſ.* 4. *that* Paul *ſpeaks only of his domeſticks*, which is a moſt miſerable *effugium*: for to omit that *Paul* keeped not ſuch a port, as to have ſo many domeſticks, he expreſly calls thoſe three perſons, *Ariſtarchus*, *Marcus*, *Juſtus*, all the fellow-labourers in the Goſpel he had at *Rome*.

Secondly, *Bellarmine* anſwers to 2 *Tim.* 4. 16. That *Paul* ſpeaks there of thoſe who might have been interceſſors for him to *Nero*; which is a very ſimple evaſion, he hath no ground at all for it; and it is clear againſt the meaning of *Paul* who ſpeaks of thoſe who ſhould have corroborated him, or confirmed him, as appears from verſe 17. where he affirms, that God was with him and ſtrengthened him only, except *Luke*, verſe 11. But if *Peter* had been at *Rome*, he would not have neglected ſuch a duty to *Paul*.

Thirdly, *Bellarmine* anſwers, That perphaps *Peter* was elſewhere when *Paul* wrote thoſe Epiſtles from *Rome*; which is as much to ſay, that *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome*, and yet

was

was never at *Rome*, when the Scripture makes mention of the Teachers of that Church, that *Paul* could never find him at *Rome*, albeit *Dionysius*, praised by *Bellarmine*, affirms, *cap.* 3. that he was at *Rome* the same time with *Paul*, and died with him in one day. And this much of those reasons, proving that *Peter* was never at *Rome*; although they be not demonstrative, yet they are very perswasive. *Velenus* in a Treatise purposly writen of that subject, adds many more, but these are sufficient in this Compend.

In the next place, we will alledge some unanswerable reasons, proving that although *Peter* had been at *Rome*, yet he was never Bishop of *Rome*. The first is this, the Office of an Apostle and a Bishop (in the strict sense) are inconsistent in one person; a Bishop is restricted to a certain Charge, but an Apostle by institution is bound to have no certain Charge, as appears by those words of Christ, *Go unto the whole World*, by which words they are expresly commanded not to tye themselves to any particular place, or at least, it is permitted them not to tye themselves to a particular place: but if they had been Bishops, they were of necessity tyed to a particular Charge. If any of the Apostles had been Bishops, *Paul* had as much reason to be called so, as any other of the Apostles; but we never read, that *Paul* was Bishop of any particular Church, except only *Irenæus* and some others affirm, that he and *Peter* were conjunct Bishops of *Rome*: but that quite destroyes *Peters* Bishoprick of *Rome*, as we said before, since the word *Bishop* is taken in a large sense, as they must of necessity confesse, since *Bellarmine* will not affirm, that *Paul* was Bishop of *Rome*, in a proper sense.

The second reason is this, they confesse that *Peter* was very oft absent from *Rome*, and very long; *Carteſius* affirms, that he was 18. years absent; *Onuphrius* 7, *Bellarmine* 5, but if he had been Bishop of *Rome*, he woul not have been so long from his Charge. They affirm indeed, that he was hindered; but

but to omit that he was not hindered ſo long, how comes it, that in his abſence he wrote no Epiſtles to his Charge at *Rome*, ſince he wrote to the Jews? And whereas they affirm, that he was at *Rome* when he wrote to the Jews, it is frivolous, firſt, becauſe we ſhewed before, that his being at *Rome* at that time, depended upon the authority of *Papias*, the author of many fabulous traditions, as was proved by the teſtimony of *Euſebius*. Secondly, albeit he had been at *Rome* when he wrote thoſe Epiſtles to the Jews, he had much more reaſon to write to the Romans his own charge, in ſo long an abſence; and ſince he did not, it is evident he was never Biſhop of *Rome*.

The third reaſon is, they give *Peter* three Biſhopricks all at one time (at leaſt, ſome of them, who affirm *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome*) They all grant, that *Peter* was firſt Biſhop of *Antioch*, before he was Biſhop of *Rome*, except only *Onuphrius*, who affirms, that he was firſt Biſhop of *Rome*, and next of *Antioch*, ſo he had two Biſhopricks. *Nicephorus*, *lib.* 14. *cap.* 39. affirms, that *Anterius* Biſhop of *Rome* wrote, that *Peter* transferred his ſeat from *Rome* to *Alexandria*: by which contradictions, it appears they have no ground at all that *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome*; if it had been true, what needed them have their recourſe to ſuch contradictions?

The fourth reaſon is, *Bellarmine* affirms, *lib. de pont. Rom.* that all the right of the ſucceſſion of the Biſhop of *Rome* to *Peter* is founded upon the command of Chriſt, by which *Peter* went to *Rome* and fixed his ſeat there. But all thoſe almoſt who teſtifie *Peter* was at *Rome*, affirm, that the occaſion of his going thither was to defeat *Simon Magus*, neither do they mention any command of Chriſt at all, as the cauſe of *Peters* going thither.

The fifth reaſon is, that *Peter* and *Paul* made a paction, that *Peter* ſhould be Apoſtle of the Jews, *Paul* of the Gentiles; but if *Peter* had been Biſhop of *Rome*, that paction had been violated. *Bellarmine* anſwers, *Peters* principal charge was

the

the Jews, and *Pauls* the Gentiles: But it is replyed, if *Peter* had been Bishop of *Rome*, his chief Charge had been the Gentiles, or else he fixed his Chair where his chief Charge was not; both which are alike absurd.

The sixth reason is, that *Linus* and *Cletus* were Bishops of *Rome* when *Peter* was alive; whereby it is demonstrated, that *Peter* was not Bishop of *Rome*. That those were Bishops when *Peter* was alive, was proved in the former Chapter, and likewayes the evasion of *Bellarmine* to this objection in the same place was refuted.

Finally, as we shewed in the former Chapter, they who affirm *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, affirm also *Paul* was conjunct with him: whereby it evidently appears, that they take the word *Bishop* in a large sense, since they make *Paul* his conjunct, and doth not reckon him in the Catalogue of the Bishops of *Rome*, as we shewed in the former Chapter.

Aud thus we have compendiously examined those two famous questions, first, *Whether* Peter, *by divine institution, was Monarch of the Church?* Second, *Whether by the command of Christ, he was Bishop of* Rome. It was proved in the Preface, that the whole Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, was founded upon the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*; that the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* consisted in this, that he succeeded to *Peter*, by divine institution, in the Monarchy of the Church: which succession again, depended upon two assertions, first, That *Peter* was Monarch of the Church, by divine institution; 2. That he was Bishop of *Rome*: any of which being proven false, the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* is a cheat, and consequently also, the Doctrine of the Modern Church of *Rome* depending upon it, as Moon-shine upon the Sun, as is professed by *Bellarmine* in the Preface of his Books, *de pont. Rom.*

FINIS Libri primi.

THE GRAND IMPOSTOR DISCOVERED:

OR, AN HISTORICAL DISPUT, Of the Papacy and Popiſh Religion.

PART I. BOOK II.

Of Biſhops.

CHAP. I.

Of the ſucceſsion of the Biſhop of Rome *to* Peter.

IN the former Book, were diſputed the firſt two Queſtions, of the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, viz. *Whether* Peter *was, by divine right, Monarch of the Church?* 2. *Whether he was by divine Inſtitution, Biſhop of* Rome? Now followeth the third Queſtion, *Whether the Biſhop of* Rome, *by divine right, ſucceeded to* Peter *in the Monarchy of the Church? Bellarmine* and others brag, with great confidence to prove that

he did, but their performance is very little: not so much as one of them, when it comes to the push, brings any passage of Scripture to prove it, except only *Bozius*, *lib.* 18. *cap.* 3. where he makes use of two places, the first is *Phil.* 4. 3. the words are, *And I beseech thee, faithful yoke-fellow, help those women which laboured with me in the Gospel, with* Clement *also, and with other my fellow-labourers, whose names are in the book of life.* Any reasonable man would admire, by what Chymistry he can distill the succession of the Bishop of *Rome* to *Peter*, out of these words? He will tell you, *Clement there mentioned was Bishop of* Rome: *Secondly, That the care of those women of* Philippi *belonged to him*, Ergo, *he was œcumenick Bishop; otherwayes, how could he have any medling at* Philippi, *which was so far distant from* Rome?

Let us examine this Logick, it will recreat the Reader: First, how knows he that *Clement* was Bishop of *Rome*? He will tell you, *that there was one* Clement *that succeeded to* Peter *Bishop of* Rome.

But we ask him, though that were granted, what then? how knoweth he that it is the same *Clement* whom the Apostle mentions here? He will tell you, *this* Clement *mentioned by the Apostle, is called by* Paul *his fellow-labourer*; Ergo, *he was a Bishop, and consequently designed at least Bishop of* Rome.

But it is replyed, first, It doth not follow that *Clement* was a Bishop, because he is called by *Paul* his fellow-labourer; for that same Argument would conclude *Priscilla* and *Aquila*, a man and his wife, to be both Bishops. *Rom.* 16. *Paul* calls them his fellow-labourers.

Secondly, *Salmero* the Jesuite, pressed by the *Madeburgenses* that *Clement* was not œcumenick Bishop, because *Paul* calls him fellow-labourer, *Phil.* 4. 3 answers, *That at that time* Clement *was not designed Bishop of* Rome; *and therefore it doth*

doth not follow: where observe how he contradicts *Bozius*; *Bozius* concludes he was œcumenick Bishop designed, because *Paul* calls him fellow-labourer; *Salmero* grants, that it follows he was not designed œcumenick Bishop, because *Paul* calls him fellow-labourer: *Bozius* reasons, he is called fellow-labourer, *Ergo*, he was designed œcumenick Bishop; *Salmero* reasons, *Paul* calls him his fellow-labourer, *Ergo*, he was not designed œcumenick Bishop at that time; having no other shift to elude the Argument of the *Madeburgenses*.

Again, although it were granted, that *Paul* meant *Clement* Bishop of *Rome*, how proves he that *Clement* succeeded to *Peter* in the Monarchy of the Church? which is the Question.

He answers you, *because* Paul *desires his yoke-fellow to assist him in the care of those women at* Philippi: *for what ado had* Clement *with women in* Philippi, *he being designed Bishop of* Rome, *except the care of the Church of* Philippi *had belonged unto him, and consequently he was œcumenick Bishop?* But to omit the bad consequence of that Argument, he mistakes the words of *Paul* or their construction; *Paul* doth not desire his yoke-fellow to assist *Clement* in having a care of those women; he only desires him to have a care of those women, who laboured with *Paul* himself and with *Clement* in the Gospel: That this is the true meaning of the words, is granted by Popish Doctors themselves commenting upon this place, as *Justinianus* the Jesuite, Cardinal *Cajetanus*, *Lyranus*; yea, the French *Lovaine* Bible translates these words, *Qui ont travaillé auec moy en l' Evangile auec* Clement, *& mes autres coadiuteurs*.

The second place alledged by *Bozius*, is from 2 *Pet.* 1. 15. *I will endeavour therefore alwayes, that ye also may be able to have remembrance of those things after my departing.*

If ye ask him, how he concludes that the Bishop of *Rome* succeeded to *Peter* from those words? He tells you, *Peter*

promiseth after his death, to put those to whom he wrote in remembrance of those things, or to have a care that they should remember those things.

If ye ask him, what then? he tells you, *Since* Peter *was dead himself, he behoved to put them in remembrance by another, and that other must of necessity be one who succeeded to him in the Monarchy of the Church.* Let us retex this Logick, that the Reader may laugh.

First he suppones, that *Peter* was to put them in remembrance by another then himself, which cannot be gathered from Peters words: he answers, *Peter himself was dead*; Ergo, *he behoved to do it by another.* It is replyed, *Peter*, while he was yet alive, might have a care that they should remember these things after his death: Secondly, the whole current of Popish Doctors contradicts him, affirming, that *Peter* promiseth to have a care by himself, and not by another, that they should remember those things, *viz.* From this place they prove intercession of Saints; and so according to them, the meaning of *Peter* is, that when he is departed, he will intercede for them. Thirdly, the true meaning of *Peter* is, that while he is alive, he will endeavour to provide them faithful Pastors, to instruct them, that they may remember those things: and therefore, his meaning is nothing less then an œcumenick Bishop: and this much of *Bozius.*

Bellarmine states the question very perplexedly, and so obscurely, that it appears to any, he is diffident to make out what he undertakes: First, he observes four things, and then he falls a disputing.

His first observation is, *That the succession of the Bishop of* Rome *to* Peter, *in the Monarchy of the Church, is* Jure Divino; *But the manner or way of succession,* ratio successionis, *depends upon the fact of* Peter: which distinction of *Bellarmins* is very obscure and implicating; he explains himself, that *Peter* might never

never have fixed his seat at *Rome*, and therefore it depends upon the fact of *Peter*, that the Bishop of *Rome* succeeds to him: but he had said before, that *Peter* had fixed his seat at *Rome*, by the command of Christ: how can any make sense of those expressions? he involves himself here in many contradictions; first he affirms, that the succession of the Bishop of *Rome* to *Peter* in the Monarchie of the Church, is *Jure divino*, or by institution of Christ; but that the Bishop of *Rome* succeeded to *Peter* in the Monarchie of the Church, is not *Jure divino*, but depends upon the fact of *Peter*: which is as much to say, that the succession of the Bishop of *Rome* to *Peter* is *Jure divino*, and yet the Bishop of *Rome* succeeded not *Jure divino*.

Secondly, he affirms, *That it depended upon the fact of* Peter, *that he was Bishop of* Rome: and yet he saith, lib. 2. *Fundatur jus successionis Pontificum Romanorum, in eo, quod* Petrus Romæ *suam sedem, jubente Domino, collocaverit, atque ibidem usque ad mortem sederit*; That is, *the right of the Bishop of* Rom's *succession is founded in this*, viz. *that* Peter *at the command of Christ, fixed his bishoprick at* Rome, *and did sit Bishop there till his death.* How can those two consist together? First, *Peter* was expresly commanded by Christ to fix his Bishoprick at *Rome*; Secondly, and yet notwithstanding, it was in *Peters* option whether he should do so or not? He might be further pressed, but it is sufficient to answer here (to omit his contradictions) that all his suppositions are false: first, it is false, that the succession of the Bishop of *Rome* to *Peter* is *Jure divino*. Secondly, it is false, that the Bishop of *Rome* succeeded to *Peter*, because *Peter* fixed his seat at *Rome*, since it was proved in the former Book, that *Peter* was not Bishop of *Rome* at all. Thirdly it is most false, that *Peter* at the command of Christ, fixed his seat at *Rome*, neither doth he bring any thing to prove it, beside his own assertion: these three

places,

places, *Matth.* 16. 18, and 19. and *Joh.* 21. 15. (though it were granted that *Peter* was ordained by Christ Monarch of the Church by them, which was proved false in the former Book) mentions nothing of the fixing his seat at *Rome*.

The second observation of *Bellarmine* is this, *If ye absolutely ask* (saith he) *if the Bishop of* Rome, *by divine institution, be Monarch and Head of the Church? it is answered, certainly he is.* Where he involves himself in another contradiction: in the former observation he affirmed, that the Bishop of *Rome* his succession to *Peter* depended upon the fact of *Peter*, which he granted was changable; but nothing can be by divine institution, which depends upon an uncertainty.

His third observation is very admirable, *The Bishop of* Rome, *as the Bishop of* Rome, (saith he) *succeeds not to* Peter *Jure divino*, and yet *est de fide*; that is, we are oblieged to believe it, as an article of Faith: which is very mysterious language, how can we belive that by divine Faith, which is not revealed by God? he answers, *We are oblieged to believe it, as well as that* Paul *left his Cloak and Parchments at* Troas.

But it is replyed, those things are expresly mentioned in Scripture, and its very strange, that the Scripture should mention the Cloak and Parchments of *Paul*, and not mention the Roman Bishoprick of *Peter*, or the Bishop of *Rome*'s succession to *Peter*.

Bellarmine goes on, *They are not mentioned expresly, but deduced by necessar consequence out of Scripture.* If ye ask him from what places of Scripture? he tells you, *Its a tradition Apostolick:* If ye ask him how he proves that? he tells you, *by Councills, Fathers, Institution of Bishops, Appellations, &c.* and so he takes up the whole dispute, by producing such probations: Where the Reader may observe, that after such bragings of the succession of the Bishop of *Rome Jure divino*, in the Monarchie of the Church, the Mountains have brought forth a Mouse,

Mouse, *viz.* he brings nothing but perverted Testimonies of the Ancients, falsly translated, and many of them forged, others mutilated, as shall appear in this, and the next two following Books; where also it shall be proved, by the Testimonies of those same Councells and Fathers, pretended by him, that the succession of the Bishop of *Rome* to *Peter* in the Monarchie of the Church, is a meer fiction, not known to the Ancients of the first six Centuries: Its true indeed, that some ambitious Bishops of *Rome*, contending with the Bishops of *Constantinople* for the Primacy, (which contention did begin after the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Anno* 453.) invented this fiction of the succession of the Bishop of *Rome* to *Peter*: But that it was a new invented fiction, appears by two reasons: The first is, because the Council of *Chalcedon*, Canon 28. made the Bishop of *Constantinople* equal in Jurisdiction to the Bishop of *Rome*. Its true indeed, the said Council gave the first place in dignity to the Bishop of *Rome*, but it appears expresly by the words of the Canon, that it was not by any reason of succession to *Peter*, but only because *Rome* was the chief imperial City; the words in the Original are, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πῶλιν ἐκείνην, because *Rome* was the imperial City: where it is to be observed, that *Aetius* for the Bishop of *Constantinople*, and *Paschasinus* for the Bishop of *Rome*, had pleaded with great animosity for the Primacy before the said Council; both alledging the sixth Canon of the Council of *Neice*, (*Paschasinus* not mentioning *Tu es Petrus* at all) in the end, the Council having heard them both at length, pronounced in favour of the Bishop of *Constantinople*, interpreting the sixth Canon of the Council of *Neice*, as making all the Patriarchs equal in Jurisdiction with the Bishop of *Rome*: after which Decree of the Council, the following Bishops of *Rome* devised *Tu es Petrus*, pleading for the Primacy.

The

The second reason is, that in the latter end of the sixth Century, *Pelagius Secundus* and *Gregorius Primus*, Bishops of *Rome*, pleaded with great animosity against a visible Head of the Church, as Derogatory to Christ: and *Gregorius* amongst other reasons, useth this for one, *that Peter was not universal Apostle, or visible head of the Church*, Epistola 32. but more of that hereafter. Since then before the latter end of the fifth Age, never any Bishop of *Rome* pleaded the succession by *Peter* unto the Monarchie of the Church, and since *Gregorius* in the beginning of the seventh Age expresly disputed against it, it is evident, that the succession of the Bishop of *Rome* to *Peter*, is a new devised fiction: yea, it shall be proved, *lib.* 5. that the said succession to *Peter* was held no article of Faith in the Church of *Rome*, before the eleventh Age, and not then neither, without great contention.

Bellarmin's fourth observation is this, *That the universal Bishoprick, and the Bishoprick of* Rome, *are not two Bishopricks*, nisi potentia, *and therefore they are but one Bishoprick:* wherein he expresly contradicts himself; he said before, that the succession of the Bishop of *Rome* to *Peter* in the Monarchie of the Church was *Jure divino*, but as he was Bishop of *Rome*, it was not *Jure divino*; now he makes them one Bishoprick, but how can that consist, since he had made them before two, whereof the one was *Jure divino*, and the other not?

Secondly, *Bellarmine* may be asked, Whether the *Pope* be Bishop of *Rome*, because he is universal Bishop? or if he be universal Bishop, because he is Bishop of *Rome*? (one of the two must of necessity follow, since they are on Bishoprick in effect, and distinct only *potentia*) if he affirm he is Bishop of *Rome*, because he is universal Bishop; then it followeth, that *Peter* had been Bishop of *Rome*, although he had never been at *Rome*: and consequently, he was Bishop of *Rome*, when he was Bishop of *Antioch*. If he affirm, he is universal Bishop, because

cauſe he is Biſhop of *Rome*, it follows, he is univerſal Biſhop, becauſe he is a particular Biſhop, which is againſt nature, and reaſon: And this much of the ſtating of the queſtion.

Bellarmine having ſtated the queſtion, falls a diſputing, and it appears by his firſt Argument more diſtinctly, what he means, which *Oedipus* himſelf could not gather from his ſtating of the queſtion: his Argument is this, *One or other of neceſſity behoved to ſucceed to* Peter *in the Monarchy of the Church*, Jure divino, *but no other but the Biſhop of* Rome *could ſucceed to him*, Ergo, *the Biſhop of* Rome *ſucceeded to him*. That one or other behoved to ſucceed to *Peter*, he proves by ſix reaſons, which in effect is the ſum and repetition of all thoſe two prolix diſputs of his, that the Government of the Church is *Jure divino* Monarchicall, and that *Peter* was the ſaid Monarch.

His firſt reaſon is, *Becauſe the Church is the end of a Biſhoprick: ſince the Church is one, therefore there muſt be one Biſhop in the Church.*

But it is anſwered, Chriſt is that one Biſhop: that the Church ſhould have any other Biſhop under Chriſt as a viſible head, *Bellarmine* ſuppones falſly; its a ſort of diſputing called *Petitio principii*, where the thing is taken as granted, which is the ſtate of the queſtion.

His ſecond reaſon is, *That in the times of the Apoſtles the Church had a viſible head under Chriſt: But the Government of the Church is ever the ſame.*

But its anſwered, it is falſe, that in the times of the Apoſtles the Church had a viſible head; as was prolixly, proved, *lib* 1.

His third reaſon is of the ſame mettal, *Joh.* 21. 15. Chriſt ſaith to *Peter*, *Paſce oves meas*, *Feed my Sheep.*

But it is anſwered, that paſſage was prolixly anſwered before.

His fourth reaſon is, by *feeding of the ſheep of Chriſt*, is meaned,

feeding of all the Sheep of Christ, which none but one visible Head could do. But that objection was also answered before, *lib.* 1.

His fifth reason is, from 1 Cor. 12. 21. *The head cannot say unto the feet, I have no need of you.* From which place he reasons thus: *The Church* (saith he) *is compared to a humane Body with a Head. here the Head is brought in speaking to the Members, that it cannot say,* I have no need of you. *Or, which is all one, this Head of the Church hath need of the Members, but this must be another Head then Christ, because Christ hath no need of the Members.*

But it is answered, this is a flat abusing of Scripture: the scope of the Apostle in that place is to show, that although some in the Church have more excellent Gifts then others; yet, the fellowship and endeavours of those of mean Gifts is necessar, for the edification of the Church: which he proves, by a similitude taken from a humane Body, where some Members are more noble, as the Head; some less, as the Feet: "And (saith he) as the Head cannot say unto the Feet, I "have no need of you, or ye are not necessary to the Body; "So they of more excellent Gifts in the Church, cannot say "unto those of meaner Gifts, we have no need of you, nei- "ther are ye necessary for the edification of the Church: That this is the true exposition of this place, appears by the Interpretation of all the Ancients, as *Ambrosius, Chrysostomus, Theophylactus*, whose Interpretation is also followed by those two Leaders of the School-men *Lombardus* and *Aquinas*; neither did ever any Interpreter dream to prove a visible Head out of this place, before the times of the Jesuites, as *Bellarmine, Sanderus* and *Turrianus*. Their reason is most ridiculous, *There is but one Head of the Body*, (say they) *to which the Church is compared*; Ergo, *there is but one Head in the Church*. Which Argument may be retorted thus, *There are but two Feet in the Body, to which the* Church

Church is compared; Ergo, *there are but two Feet in the Church, or two only in the Church, who have meaner Gifts.* The Sophiſtry diſcovers it ſelf; for according to the Interpretation of the Ancients, that *one Head of the Body* anſwers to many perſons in the Church, as appears by the 70. Epiſtle of *Baſilius* to the Biſhops of *Italy* and *France*, where he hath theſe words, *Cum igitur non poſsit Caput Pedibus dicere, Non eſtis mihi neceſſarii, omnino non tolerabitis nos abdicari; Since the Head cannot ſay unto the Feet, ye are not neceſſary, ye will not ſuffer us to be abdicated, or cut off* He repeats the ſame words, *Epiſt.* 77. to the *Tranſmarine* Biſhops. Likewayes, *Primaſius, Oecumenius*, and the Author of thoſe Commentaries attributed to *Hieronymus*, compares all Biſhops to that *one Head of the Body*, and ſo doth *Aquinas*, to which he compares alſo the *Civil Magiſtrates.* And this much of that head, mentioned 1 *Cor.* 12. 21.

Bellarmin's laſt reaſon to prove, *That the Government of the Church is* Jure Divino *Monarchical, and conſequently, that one or other behoved to ſucceed to* Peter, is taken from the High Prieſt in the Old Teſtament; *under whom the Government of the Church was Monarchical*, Ergo, (ſaith he) *the Government of the Church under the New Teſtament, is* Jure Divino *Monarchical, under one viſible Head.*

But it is anſwered, firſt, many things were in the Church-government in the Old Teſtament, which are not in that of the New; and therefore the Argument doth not follow. Secondly, *Bellarmine* could not have produced a ſharper Sword to cut his own throat: for the High prieſt in the Old Teſtament was a Type of Chriſt, and as the ſaid High prieſt governed the Church, without a viſible Head under him in the Old Teſtament; So Chriſt governs the Church in the New Teſtament, without a viſible Head under him. And this much of thoſe reaſons, by which *Bellarmine* endeavours to prove,

that one or other behoved to succeed to Peter *in the Monarchy of the Church.*

In the next place he endeavours to prove, that the Bishop of *Rome* succeeded to him; which he doth thus: *Either the Bishop of* Antioch, *or else the* Bishop *of* Rome, *succeeded to* Peter *in the Monarchy of the Church: but not the Bishop of* Antioch, Ergo, *the Bishop of* Rome.

But it is answered, first it is false, that either the Bishop of *Antioch*, or the Bishop of *Rome* succeeded to *Peter* in the Monarchy of the Church, since we proved before, that *Peter* was not Monarch of the Church himself, and therefore no Bishop could succeed him in the Monarchy of the Church. Secondly, We proved also in the last Chapter of the first Book, that *Peter* was Bishop of no particular Church. Thirdly, though it were granted, that either the Bishop of *Antioch*, or the Bishop of *Rome*, behoved to succeed to *Peter* in the Monarchy of the Church, the Bishop of *Antioch* ought to be preferred to the Bishop of *Rome*; because we have Scripture expresse that *Peter* was at *Antioch*, but none at all that he was at *Rome*; but on the contrary, it appears by infallible presumptions from Scripture, that he was never at *Rome*, as was proved in the last Chapter of the former Book; where it was also proved, that the Testimonies of those Fathers, by which *Peter* was proved to be at *Rome*, were grounded on the Authority of *Pappias*, an Author meriting no credit, in the opinion of *Eusebius*.

Bellarmine in the next place endeavours to prove, *That the Bishop of* Rome *succeeded to* Peter *in the Monarchy of the Church*, by several general Arguments; As, 1. *Testimonies of general Councils.* 2. *Of Bishops of* Rome *themselves.* 3. *Of Greek Fathers.* 4. *Of Latine Fathers.* 5. *From Viccars.* 6. *From Right of Appellations.* 7. *From exemption from judgement.* 8. *From ordination of Bishops.* 9. *From Laws, Dispensations and Censures.* 10. *From Names or Titles.*

In

In the following Books, we shall not miss one of his Arguments of any moment unanswered, and not retorted. But, to avoid repetitions, we will alter his method, distinguishing the Bishop of *Romes* succession to *Peter* in several Intervals, as was shewed in the Preface of this Treatise: in this second Book, we will dispute the succession of the Bishop of *Rome* to *Peter*, in the Monarchy of the Church, from the dayes of the Apostles, untill the death of *Cyprian*; that is, untill *anno*, 260. or thereabout, insisting most upon these four following particulars:

First, we will dispute the occasion of the opinion of *Aerius*, by whom it was maintained, unto *cap.* 5.

In the second place we will dispute, that there was no Office in the Church during that interval, above that of a Bishop, unto *cap.* 9.

In the third place, we will answer what is objected for the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* in that interval by our adversaries, unto *cap* 13.

Fourthly, we will examine several forgeries, pretended by our adversaries for the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* in that interval. Of which in order.

CHAP. II.

The occasion of the opinion of Aerius, *who were his followers, and what the Bishop of* Rome *was at first in their opinion?*

SOme Protestants stumble at the word *Hierarchy*, and will needs have the word *Hierodulia* put in the place of it, the first word in the Original signifying *Church-ruling*, the last *Church-ministry*: However, that the Church *Hierarchy* or *Hierodulie*, instituted by the Apostles, consisted of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, is denyed by none; as in civil families, some servants had titles of honour given them, and

and were called πιστικοι, *majores domus familiam ducentes, trusties, master-housholds rulers, of the family*; others were called by the common name of *Servants*: So in the Ministry of the Church, some Ministers had titles of honour given them, and were called επισκοποι, *Overseers, Bishops*; πρεσβυτεροι, *Presbyters, Elders*; all other Ministers of the Church were called διακονοι, *Deacons*, which is as much as to say, *Ministers*, or were called by the name of Ministers common to them all. Those titles of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* are borrowed by a metaphor from the civil administration; they who ruled Cities of old among the Jews and Grecians were called *Presbyters*, and rulers of Provinces were called επισκοποι, *Bishops, Overseers*, as appears by 1 *Maccab.* 1. All other Church Ministers were called Deacons or Ministers simply.

In the times of the Apostles, Bishops were called Presbyters, and Presbyters Bishops; so *Tit.* 1. those who are called Presbyters, *verse* 5. are called Bishops, *verse* 7. It appears also by *Philip.* 1. and 1 *Tim.* 3. and *Acts* 20. that the Rulers of Churches in one City are called Bishops in the plural number; which could not be, if Presbyters were not called Bishops, since there could be but one Bishop in one City, as all know. Those also who lived at the same time with the Apostles, speak after the same manner: *Clement* Bishop of *Rome*, mentioned by *Paul*, and familiar with him in his Epistles directed to the *Corinthians* (which Epistle is mentioned by *Hieronymus*, but never seen, till of late *Cyrillus*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, sent it from the Bibliothick of *Alexandria* to King *James*, as a precious monument of Antiquity) calls the Rulers of the Church of *Corinth* Bishops in the plural number, directing his Epistle to the *Bishops and Deacons of Corinth*: and likewayes in the body of his Epistle, he calls those very persons Bishops in one place, whom he calls Presbyters in another. *Polycarpus* also directs an Epistle to the Presbyters and Deacons of *Philippi*, and

and in the body of his Epiſtle he calls theſe very perſons Biſhops: this *Polycarpus* was the diſciple of *John*.

This manner of ſpeaking continued unto the latter end of the ſecond Age. *Irenæus*, who lived about that time, in an Epiſtle to *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome*, calls the predeceſſors of the ſaid *Victor*, *Preſbyters, ruling the Church of* Rome: Likewayes, whom he calls *Preſbyters*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 2. in the very next Chapter he calls *Biſhops*; and again, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 43. he calls them *Preſbyters*. *Pius* alſo Biſhop of *Rome*, in an Epiſtle to *Juſtus* Biſhop of *Vienna*, ſpeaking of the ſucceſſion of Biſhops in ſeveral Places, calls it a *ſucceſſion of Preſbyters*. Other Teſtimonies might be multiplied to this purpoſe, but it is needleſſe, ſince it is confeſſed by *Bellarmine* and *Petavius*, that in thoſe primitive times, Presbyters were called Biſhops, and Biſhops Presbyters promiſcuouſly.

Aerius, who lived about the midle of the fourth Age, believed for that reaſon, that the Office of a Biſhop and a Presbyter in thoſe times was one and the ſame; and that no Biſhop was *Jure Divino*, above a Presbyter: which opinion *Epiphanius*, *Hereſie* 75. calls *Furioſum dogma*, and for that reaſon, ranks *Aerius* among Hereticks: but he anſwers the Arguments of *Aerius* vere childiſhly, in the opinion of *Bellarmine* himſelf; for when *Aerius* objected thoſe formentioned paſſages of Scripture, naming many Biſhops in one City, *Epiphanius* anſwers, the reaſon is, *Becauſe in theſe times there was ſuch penury of Presbyters, that many Biſhops were in one City*: then which anſwer, nothing is more ridiculous. However, the authority of *Epiphanius* is of no more weight to make any Opinion Hereſie, then the authority of ſome other Fathers, who declared them Hereticks who maintained the *Antipodes*, *Avertinus*, *lib.* 3. *Anal.* *Auguſtinus* alſo ſeems to call *Aerius* an Heretick, but its very like, that he calls him ſo for ſome other reaſon, then denying the divine

right

right of Bishops: other things were laid to the charge of *Aerius* (how justly is doubted) it may be also that *Augustinus* takes *Heresie* in a large sense as it comprehends *Schisme:* for he professeth himself in that place, he knoweth not what is the regular distinction of *Heresie.* That Schismaticks were sometimes called Hereticks, appears by the sixth Canon of the first Council of *Constantinople,* which, *In codice canonum,* is 169.

That *Augustine* called not *Aerius* an Heretick, for denying the divine right of Bishops, but only for making a separation upon that account, or else for some other reason, is evident; because, not only *Augustinus* himself, but also many others of the most eminent Fathers, seem to be of the same opinion with *Aerius,* as *Medina* confesseth; and although *Bellarmine* and *Petavius* reprehend *Medina* for so saying, yet in end, both are forced to acknowledge, that some of those Fathers were of that opinion. Likewayes, many Popish Doctors came very near the opinion of *Aerius*; all the Protestant Divines abroad, for the most part, are of that opinion; and many learned Protestants at home, as *Whitaker, Reynolds, &c.* although some eminent English Divines be against it, as *Andrews, Hall,* and other learned men. However, it is certain, that none were more submissive to Episcopal Government amongst the ancient Fathers, and some of the modern Doctors, then those who dispute expresly against the divine right of Bishops; as *Augustinus quæst.* 101. upon 1 *Tim.* 3. *Hilarius* upon the same place, and likewayes upon *Ephes.* 4. *Hieronymus* in his Epistle to *Euagrius,* and likewayes upon *Tit.* 1. *Ambrosius* (as he is cited by *Amalarius*) upon *Tim.* 3. *Chrysostomus* and his admirer *Theophylactus, Primasius œcumenius Sedulius* upon *Tit.* 1. and among the late Fathers, *Amalarius, Isidorus, Rabanus Maurus*; amongst the Popish Divines, *Cusanus, lib.* 2. *de concordia Catholica, cap.* 13. *Contarenus* and *Dionysius, Carthusianus* on *Philip.* 1. *Durandus in Rationali,* lib. 2. cap. *de Sacerdotibus,* and

and likewayes upon the sentences, *lib.* 4. *dist.* 34. *q.* 5. *Marsilius Patavinus*, dict. 2. cap. 15. *Haymo* on *Philip.* 1. *Aserius* the Jesuite, *P.* 2. *Q.* 2. *cap.* 16. All which Popish Doctors came very near the opinion of *Aerius*, and yet were very submissive to Episcopal Government: *Whitaker*, a most stout defender of *Aerius*, yet was most submissive to the Episcopal Government; and many of the most eminent Divines abroad, who defended the opinion of *Aerius*, yet in their Epistles to several English Divines, they exhort dissatisfied persons, to submit to the Government of the Church of *England*: which in effect is, the same with that Church Government which was established by the first general Council of *Neice*.

Those who follow the opinion of *Aerius*, affirm, that the Bishop of *Rome*, in the beginning, was nothing else but the first Presbyter, or first ordained Presbyter, amongst the Presbyters of the Church of *Rome*: *Hilarius* by many cited by the name of *Ambrosius*) upon *Eph.* 4. affirms, that in those primitive times, a Bishop was nothing else but *primus Presbyter*, that is, *Presbyter of oldest ordination*, and he dying, the next in order coming to be first Presbyter, became *hoc ipso* Bishop, without any new ordination; as appears by the the same Author, 1 *Tim.* 3. where he expresly affirms, when any is ordained *Sacerdos*, he is ordained both Bishop and Presbyter; for, saith he, *Una est ordinatio Presbyteri & Episcopi, quia uterque est Sacerdos*. That is, *The ordination of a Bishop and Presbyter in one, because both are Priests*: Whence it appears that *Bellarmine* is mistaken, who affirms, that a first Presbyter behoved to be ordained of new, when he became Bishop, according to the opinion of that Author: *Petavius* grants, that a first Presbyter became Bishop, without any new formall ordination, but it was requisite that he should be consecrated by a secret imposition of hands, called by him μυστικὴν χειροτονίαν, that is, *a mysticall imposition of hands*; but he brings no probation,

he only affirms it. We read of such a secret imposition of hands, not in that case, but in other two: the first is, when *Miletius* troubled all *Ægypt* by his ordaining without authority, those whom he ordained were not formally re-ordained, but only consecrated by that *secret imposition of hands, or privat imposition of hands*, as witnesseth *Theodoretus, lib. 1. cap. 10.* The other case is, those who were baptized by *Hereticks*, were not re-baptized, but only anointed with the Chrisme, together with that *secret imposition of hands*: both the one and the other case is mentioned by *Justinus, in Respons. ad Orthodox.* It is to be observed, that although the first Presbyter was called Bishop, *Antonomasticè*, yet the other Presbyters were called Bishops; and the first Presbyter sometimes *Episcopus Episcoporum, Bishop of Bishops*; so the Apostle *James* is called by *Clement*, when the said *James* was Bishop or first Presbyter of *Jerusalem*: whence appears, the weakness of that objection of *Bellarmine*, proving that the Bishop of *Rome* was reputed œcumenick Bishop, because he is stiled by some, *Episcopus Episcoporum, Bishop of Bishops.*

CHAP. III.

Conjectures of Aerians, concerning the original, progress, and universal establishment of Episcopacy.

THe first step then of the Bishop of *Rome* (in the opinion of those who follow *Aerius*) was from a first Presbyter to a Bishop. Before the time that Bishops and Presbyters were distinguished, all Presbyters were called Bishops, but after that time, no Presbyter was called Bishop, as *Ambrosius* (cited by *Amalarius*) affirms, on 1 *Tim.* 3. The word *Bishop* in greek ἐπίσκοπος imports as much as an *Overseer*; those who had the oversight of any charge were called by the Græcians ἐπίσκοποι, *Bishops*; so we find in *Xenophon* Physitians called,

called. And in other Authors Moderators of Controversies, and Visitors of Cities amongst the Athenians, were called Bishops. Rulers of Provinces, or who were set over Provinces, 1 *Maccab.* 1. are called ἐπισκοποι, *Bishops*. Yea, in the glosses of the old Græcians, *Kings* are called *Bishops*: *Hesychius* amongst his glosses hath ἐπισκοπος & βασιλευς, in the same sense in which they are called by *Homer*, λαων ποιμενες, *Pastors of the people*; by which it appears (if we durst affirm it) that *Salmasius* is in a mistake, affirming that *Bishop* is only a word of care, tutelage, or curatory, and not a word of rule or command: *Bellarmine* also is in a mistake, who eludes that passage of *Augustine*, *a Bishop is greater then a Presbyter by consuetude*; affirming the meaning of *Augustine* to be, that before the times of Christians, the word *Bishop* was not a title of honour, but by the consuetude of Christians, it became to be so.

The time when Episcopacy did first begin, is guessed to be about the latter end of the second Age, when *Victor* was Bishop of *Rome*: which conjecture is proved by two reasons: The first is this, *Ambrosius* on 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. (as he is cited by *Amalarius*) affirms, *That after Episcopacy was brought in, Presbyters were called no more Bishops as they were before, nor were Bishops called Presbyters*: but we read in the Epistles of *Victor*, that *Presbyters are called Bishops, and Bishops Presbyters*, as was before-mentioned; but after the time of *Victor* we find, that neither Bishops are called Presbyters, nor Presbyters Bishops: whereby it is very probable, that in those dayes a Bishop was distinguished from a Presbyter. The second reason is this, *Ignatius* (falsly believed to be the Disciple of *John*) lived about that time, and in his Epistle to the *Magnesians*, calls Episcopacy νεωτερικην ταξιν, *a new Ordination*, whence it appears, it did begin about that time. That the said *Ignatius* lived in those dayes (and consequently could not be that *Ignatius* who was the disciple of *John*) appears, because he

mentions the heresie of *Valentinus*, who affirmed, *that Christ proceeded from Sices*; which Heresie was never heard of, till immediatly before the times of *Victor*; and therefore the said *Ignatius* behoved to live after the time of *Valentinus*, and consequently about the time of *Victor*. To which two reasons, may be added a third, (*viz.*) That the said *Magnesians* and *Tralliani* were so averse from receiving of Bishops, (as if those *Tralliani* had been so called after Mr. *Robert Trail*) that *Ignatius* was forced to spend much Rhetorick, to perswade them to receive a Bishop: but it is very unlike they would have been so refractory, if Bishops had been among them from the beginning: And this much of the original of Episcopacy.

As for the progress; Bishops were not brought in, in all places at one time, but by degrees, first at one place, then at another: It is very like they first began at *Rome*, and that *Victor* was the first Bishop that ever was; he was a very aspireing man, and for his presumption, was sharply rebuked by *Irenæus*, and bitterly mocked by *Tertullian*: and therefore, it's very unlike such an alteration of Government could begin in any other City then *Rome*, which was the chief Imperial City: for which reason, *Potentior principalitas*, a more powerful principality was attributed to the Church of *Rome* by *Irenæus, by reason of which* (saith he) *and also by reason that the Traditions of the Apostles were preserved more purely there, it is necessary that all Churches conform themselves to that Church.*

That Episcopacy was not established in all places at once, in alike perfection, is evident by three reasons. The first is, when Presbyters in other places had no ordination, they had it still at *Alexandria* unto the times of *Heraclas* and *Dionysius*, which was about *Anno* 235. as is testified by *Ambrosius* (by some thought *Hilarius*) on *Ephes.* 4. and *Augustinus* (if he be the Author) on *Tim.* 1. 3. *quæst.* 101. upon the Old and

New

New Testament, and *Hieronymus* in his Epistles to *Euagrius*. The second reason is, when Bishops only confirmed in the West, Presbyters confirmed throughout all the East, as is testified by *Cyrillus Hierosolmitanus*, in his Catechise *de Chrismate*, and *Severus Alexandrius*, *de Ritibus Baptismi*. The third reason is, when in many places Bishops had sole ordination and sole jurisdiction, in *Africa* they were inhibited, and expressly forbidden, either to ordain or to exercise jurisdiction, without concurrence of Presbyters; as appears by the 22. and 24. Canons of the fourth Council of *Carthage*.

When Episcopacy was universally established, was as uncertain, as when it first began. *Hieronymus* affirms, it was decreed *through the whole world*; *Ambrosius* or *Hilarius* affirms, it was established *prospiciente concilio*; but none could tell, as Bishop *Hall* objects, what either the one or the other meaned? but of late it is discovered, that both mean the 4. Canon of the first Council of *Neice*. *Eutychius* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, in his Books *de originibus* (newly published in Arabick and Latine by *Seldenus*) testifies, *that* Alexander *Bishop of* Alexandria, *did take the power of ordination from the Presbyters there, who before that time had the power of ordaining their Bishop*. And since *Eutychius* affirms, that the said *Alexander* was present at the Council of *Neice*, without all question, he inhibited Presbyters to ordain the Bishop of *Alexandria*, by authority of the said 4. Canon of the Council of *Neice*; neither could any authority, except that of a general Council, establish any thing universally; neither was there any general Council, before that of *Neice*.

CHAP.

CAP. IV.

Wherein a Bishop differs from a Presbyter? Conjectures of Aerians wherefore Episcopacy was brought in the Church?

After Episcopacy was established, a Bishop differs from a Presbyter by ordination: whence nothing is more frequent with *Augustinus*, *Hieronymus*, *Ambrosius*, *Chrysostomus*, and other Fathers, then *that a Bishop differs from a Presbyter by ordination*, which is all the Argument that *Bellarmine* and others produce to prove, that the forsaid Fathers were for the divine right of Bishops: But since those Fathers expressly dispute against the divine right of Bishops, since they tell a reason wherefore Episcopacy was brought in, since they tell the time when, (albeit obscurely) it is evident, that those Fathers speaks so, according to the consuetude of their own times; that is, *Bishops have ordination, and Presbyters have it not, not by divine right, but only by consuetude*: yea, *Hieronymus* upon *Titus*, after he hath disputed most vehemently against the divine right of Bishops, concludes his dispute with these words, *Ita Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine quam dispositionis dominicæ veritate Presbyteris esse majores*; That is, *Bishops should know that they are greater then Presbyters, more by consuetude then divine right*; which passage is so evident, that not only *Medina*, but also *Alphonsus de Castro*, *Albertus Pighius*, *Petavius*, yea, *Bellarmine* and Bishop *Hall*, are forced to confesse, that *Hieronymus* was against the divine right of Bishops: which last, calls him a waspish man, and that he was irritated by *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*.

The reasons wherefore Episcopacy was brought in, are three, according to those Fathers: the first reason is of *Ambrosius* (or according to some *Hilarius*) upon *Ephes.* 4. who after he had told, that in the primitive times, a Bishop was no other

other then a first Presbyter, or the Presbyter of oldest ordination in any City; he subjoynes, that Bishops were after that time, not by succession, but by election; *because the first Presbyter was many times unworthy, and therefore not the first, but the most worthy was chosen Bishop.* The second reason is of *Ambrosius* (as he is cited by *Amalarius*) upon 1 Tim 3. (*viz*) *because Presbyters, in following times, had not such eminent gifts, as those who lived in the primitive times; therefore it was not fit, that the Church should be governed alike by them all any more: therefore the most eminent in gifts, of the number of Presbyters, was chosen Bishop, differing from the other Presbyters by Ordination; and he who was so chosen, was no more called Presbyter, but Bishop: and the other Presbyters were no more called Bishops, but only Presbyters:* the third reason is of *Hieronymus* upon *Tit.* 1. who affirms, Bishops were brought in, to take away Schisms, such as when one said, *he was of Paul, another he was of Cephas, another he was of Apollos.*

Petavius hierarchiæ, lib. 1. *cap.* 10. *num.* 8. and in other places, acckowledgeth, *that the Office of a Bishop and a Presbyter concurred in one Person in some Cities in the times of the Apostles:* but he endeavours to prove, by this passage of *Hieronymus*, that custome was changed in the times of the Apostles themselves; (*viz.*) when that Schisme was among the Corinthians, *one saying he was of Paul, another he was of Cephas*, &c. *Bellarmine* and Bishop *Hall*, by the same passage, endeavour to bind contradictions upon *Hieronymus*; because he affirms on *Tit.* 1 *that according to Paul, a Bishop and a Presbyter is all one*; and in the same place he affirms, *that according to* Paul *they were made different a long time before*, (*viz.*) *when that Schisme was among the Corinthians*, which Schisme was before *Paul* wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians, which first Epistle, was written long before the

Epistle

Epistle to *Titus*: But it is answered, it is very strange, that any eminent person as Bishop *Hall*, should own such a *Proter-vum Sophisma*; and therefore, to return the sharp edge of the Weapon, whereas they strike only with the blunt, it is reasoned thus; *Hieronymus* affirmeth, according to *Paul*, *Tit.* 1. *The Office of a Bishop and a Presbyter is one and the same*; *Ergo*, it cannot be the meaning of *Hieron mus*, that they were made different precisely at that time, when that Schisme was among the Corinthians, since he could not be ignorant, that Schisme fell out long before *Paul* wrote his Epistle to *Titus*: the intention then of *Hieronymus* is, not to tell precisely the time when? but only the cause why a Bishop was made different from a Presbyter, (*viz.*) *Schisme*, such as that among the Corinthians, not that very Schisme among the Corinthians: which maner of speaking is not only frequent, but also elegant, as can be made out both by Scripture, and prophane Authors, if it were needfull, or any versed in either, had the Brow to deny it.

CHAP. V.

What primacy the Bishop of Rome *had before other Bishops, before the times of* Cyprian.

AND this much of the original, progress and universal establishment of Episcopacy, of the difference between a Presbyter and a Bishop, and for what reasons Bishops were brought in. Now it is requisite to declare, what Primacy was due to the Bishop of *Rome* during that time, when no Office was in the Church above that of a Bishop? (*viz*) before the time of *Cyprian*, who lived about *Anno* 250. or 60. that is, seventy or eighty years before the Council of *Neice*. During then that interval, we find two sort of priorities among Bishops, neither of which imported any authority or jurisdiction of one Bishop above another; they imported only a priority

priority of precedency or place. The firſt was, priority of Age, that is, he who was firſt ordained Biſhop, had the place of him who was ordained after him; and in that reſpect, the primacy of Biſhops was ambulatory in every Province; except the Biſhop of the firſt City of the Province, where the Roman Governour remained; and that Biſhop had the place of all the Biſhops of the Province, although later ordained then any of them, and was called *Primæ Sedis Epiſcopus*, or *Biſhop of the firſt Seat*, which was the other ſort of priority among Biſhops. In a word then, the Biſhop of the firſt City of the Province, had a fixed priority; Biſhops of the other Cities had an ambulatory priority, that is, now one, now another, according to the time of their ordination: and for that reaſon, they were all called *Secundæ Sedis Epiſcopi*, or, *Biſhops of the ſecond Seat*, not ſome of them *Biſhops of the third, and others of the fourth Seat*, becauſe now this Biſhop, then another; or now Biſhop of this City, then of another, was Biſhop of the ſecond Seat, according to the priority of his ordination. It is to be obſerved, that after *Juſtinianus*, the priority of the firſt Biſhops themſelves, or Biſhops of the firſt Seat, was made ambulatory in *Africa*, by a Conſtitution of the ſaid *Juſtinianus*; except only the Biſhop of *Carthage*, who ſtill remained fixed firſt Biſhop, whether he were of older or newer ordination; becauſe *Carthage* was the firſt City of the firſt Province of *Africa*. In like manner, the Biſhop of *Rome* was the fixed firſt Biſhop of all the world, becauſe *Rome* was the firſt City of the firſt Province of the world; and for that reaſon (as we ſaid) *potentior principalitas*, or, *a more powerful principality* was attributed to the Church of *Rome* by *Irenæus*. The Church of *Rome* in thoſe dayes was of no further extent then the walls of the City, as is at large demonſtrated by *Salmaſius*; for the Biſhop of *Rome* then was only a Biſhop, and was neither Metropolitan, nor Patriarch, much leſs an œcumenick Biſhop.

That the Bishop of *Rome* was first Bishop, because *Rome* was the first City of the Empire, and for no other reason, appears not only by what is said, but also, because for the same reason, he was declared *first Metropolitan* by the second general Council of *Constantinople*, and *first Patriarch* by the fourth general Council of *Chalcedon*, and *œcumenick Bishop* by *Phocas*, as shall be declared hereafter at large: whereby it is evident, That the Bishop of *Rome*, had still the priority for civil respects, and by humane ordination, and not at all by divine institution, or by reason of succession to *Peter*; for in that respect, the Bishop of *Antioch*, would be preferred to the Bishop of *Rome*, because he is Bishop of *Antioch*, or rather founded the Church of *Antioch* before ever he saw *Rome*: and whereas *Petavius*, and others affirm, that the Bishop of *Rome* was successor to *Peter*, because *Peter* died at *Rome*; it is frivolous, 1. Because *Velenus*, *Salmasius*, and others prove by unanswerable reasons, that *Peter* neither lived, nor died at *Rome*, that is, was never at *Rome*, whose reasons were summed in the former Book, *cap.* 24. 2. Because *Peter*, although he had been at *Rome*, yet was never Bishop at *Rome*, but only in a large sense, *(viz.) as Bishop* comprehends *the founder of any Church*, in which sense *Paul* may be called *the Bishop of Corinth, Thessalonica*, &c. yet in that respect, *Paul* is to be preferred to *Peter*, because he not only founded the Church of *Rome*, as all agree, and not *Peter* as many affirm; but also, although he and *Peter* had founded the Church of *Rome* joyntly, he is to be preferred to the Bishoprick of *Rome*; because *Rome* was a City of the Gentiles, expresly comprehended under the Apostolat of *Paul*, whereas the Jews were only committed to *Peter*; and for that reason, in the Seals annexed to the Popes Bulls, unto this day, the Images of *Paul* and *Peter* are joyntly imprinted, and that of Paul hath *the right hand*; many admire why? but the reason can be no other, then

then what we have told, (*viz.*) *becauſe although* Peter *and* Paul *are believed joyntly to have founded the Church of Rome, and therefore the image of both is imprinted in the Seals*, yet that of *Paul* hath the right hand, becauſe *Rome* was under the Apoſtolat of *Paul*, and not of *Peter*, as we ſaid. Likewayes, it is agreed by all, that *Paul* died at *Rome*, but not that *Peter*, and it is thought, that none of the Ancients knew where *Peter* died? one thing is certain, that *Clement* third Biſhop of *Rome*, ſpeaking of the deaths of *Peter* and *Paul* (to both whom he was contemporary) and who was called by *Paul* his fellow-labourer, although in his Epiſtle to the Corinthians, he ſpeaks more particularly of the martyrdome of *Paul*, when and where he died, and under whom; yet, he doth not mention the death of *Peter* ſo particularly: which he would have done, if *Peter* had died at *Rome*, in the ſame day with *Paul*, as the Romaniſts affirm. 3. If the Biſhop of *Rome*, have any priority, by reaſon of *Peters* dying at *Rome*; the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* is to be preferred to the Biſhop of *Rome*, becauſe Chriſt died at *Jeruſalem*: yea, for that reaſon, the foreſaid *Clement* ſeems to call *James* the Apoſtle (thought to be the firſt Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*) *Epiſcopum Epiſcoporum*, *or*, *Biſhop of Biſhops*; which Epithet, if any had given to the Biſhop of *Rome* in thoſe dayes, *Bellarmine* and *Barronius* would have blacked many ſheets of paper with repetitions of that Teſtimony, ingeminating it every where, as they do other teſtimonies of far leſs moment: In what ſenſe *Clement* calls *James* Biſhop of Biſhops, ſhall be ſhewed hereafter.

CHAP. VI.

The Testimonies of Dionysius *and* Ignatius, *against the Bishop of* Romes *Supremacy.*

ÆNeas Silvius, (afterwards the Pope under the name *Pius* second) in his 288. Epistle (according to the supputation of *Bellarmine*) affirms that before the Council of *Neice*, little or no regaird was had, to the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*: which confirms what we said before, *viz.* that before the times of *Cyprian*, the primacy of the Bishop of *Rome* was only of Dignity, but not of Jurisdiction, *viz.* becauſe he was Bishop of the chief Imperial City, as also becauſe he was Bishop of that particular Church, commonly believed in those dayes, to have been joyntly founded by those Princes of the Apostles, *Peter* and *Paul*. Yet notwithstanding, since the Doctors of the Church of *Rome*, endeavour to prove, by Testimonies of Fathers, and actions of Bishops of *Rome*, that the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, was acknowledged in the first three Centuries: in disputing this Question, we will observe this following method; first, we will prove by Testimonies of those Fathers, who lived in that interval, that the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, was not acknowledged in those dayes. Secondly, we will answer what is objected to the contrary from actions of Popes, and from Testimonies of Fathers. Lastly, we will discover several forgeries pretended by our Adversary, to prove the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* in that interval.

We will first assault the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, by the Testimonies of two much magnified by some of that Church: the first is, *Ignatius*, whom they affirm to be the Disciple of *St. John*; the second is *Dionysius*, believed by them to be the Disciple of *St. Paul*: and albeit we proved in another

another place that the pretended *Ignatius* was not the Disciple of *John*, and shall prove hereafter, that the pretended *Dionysius* was not the Disciple of *Paul*, mentioned *Acts*. yet, nevertheless, both the one and the other are very ancient: we proved elsewhere, that *Ignatius* lived about the time of *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*: when *Dionysius* lived, is uncertain? *Ignatius* in his Epistle to the *Trallians*, hath these words, *What is a Bishop but he who goeth beyond all command and power, who commands all as far as a man can command?* In which words, he expressly affirms, that there is no Office of the Church, above that of a Bishop: for, if a Bishop have supream command (as he expresly affirms) he can be commanded by no superior Church-ruler, as Metropolitan, Patriarch, or œcumenick Bishop. The Testimony of *Dionysius* is taken from his 8. Epistle, his words are these in substance, *Every man should strive to live blamelessly, if he do not, the Priest should take a course with him: if the Priest deborde, he should be judged by his Bishop: if the Bishop do amiss, he should be judged by the successors of the Apostles: if those again do amiss, they should be judged by those of the same order, and degree.*

In which words he quite excludes one visible Head over all; and consequently it appears, that in his dayes, the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* was not believed, as an article of Faith in the Church: since he affirms that many hold the chief place of the Hierarchy, whereof any should be judged by the rest, and not all by one visible Head, or by the Bishop of *Rome*.

What he means by *Successors to the Apostles*, whom he places above Bishops, none can tell, except he mean, *Metropolitans and Patriarchs*; if he do, its evident, he lived after the times of *Cyprian*: because in the dayes of *Cyprian*, and before, there was no Office in the Church, above that of a Bishop, as appears first, by that passage of *Ignatius*, in his

his Epistle to the *Trallians* now cited. Secondly, it appears by the Epistle of the said *Ignatius*, written to the *Magnesians*, in the which Epistle, he comprehends all Church-rulers under *Bishops and Presbyters*; where he affirms, that Bishops have the *cheif place* loco Dei, *in place of God*; *Presbyters have the next place* concessus Apostolici loco, that is, *they represent the Council of the Apostles*; the last place he gives the Deacons, to whom *the Ministery of Christ is committed*. Thirdly, that no Office was in the Church, above that of a Bishop, before the times of *Cyprian*, nor in his time, appears by those two following most notable passages of *Cyprian*, the one in his Books *de unitate Ecclesiæ*, *lib.* 4. *Epist.* 9. the other from his Oration, to the Council of *Carthage*; of which two passages in order.

CHAP. VII.

Explication of that place of Cyprian, De unitate Ecclesiæ.

THe words of *Cyprian* are, *Unus Episcopatus est cujus à singulis pars in solidum tenetur*; that is, *There is one Bishoprick, of which every Bishop hath alike full share*: by which passage of *Cyprian*, it not only appears, that the Bishop of *Rome*, in his dayes, was not believed to be visible Head of the Church; but also, that there was no Office in the Church above that of a Bishop, since every Bishop had *alike full share* of that *one Bishoprick*, which could not be, if in those dayes, Metropolitans had been above Bishops, Patriarchs above Metropolitans, and an œcumenick Bishop above all.

This notable passage of *Cyprian*, puzles the Learned of the Church of *Rome* very sore: they vary very much in their glosses upon this place of *Cyprian*, as *Rufus*, *contra* Molinæum, *Fran. Agricula*, *cap.* 18. varies from him. *Hayus*, *disput. lib.* 1. *cap.* 11. and *Turrianus* contra *Zadeel*, *lib.* 1. *cap.*

cap. 17. 26. agree almost in one Exposition, but they differ from the other two. *Sanderus*, *de visib. Monarch. lib.* 7. *num.* 45. differs from all the former. *Bellarmine*, *lib.* 2. *de pont. Rom. cap.* 16. varies from them all. We will examine the exposition of *Bellarmine*; for since they vary in their opinion about the meaning of *Cyprian*, and since the meaning of *Cyprian* can be but one, of necessity all their glosses must be false except one; and since the glos of *Bellarmine* is most approved by the Church of *Rome*, we will examine it.

Bellarmine in the forecited place, expones the words of *Cyprian* thus; *There is one Bishoprick* (saith he) *in the same way that the Church is one. But the Church is one, as many branches of the same Tree are one Tree; many rivolets are one Water; many beams one Light: as then in branches there is an unity, by reason of one Root; in rivolets, by reason of one Fountain,* &c. *So is the Church one, and consequently the Bishoprick one in its Head and Root, the Church and Bishoprick of* Rome. And whereas *Cyprian* affirms, that every Bishop hath a full share of that one Bishoprick; *Bellarmine* grants its true, but by a distinction, that is, *Though every Bishop have a full share, yet he hath not an equal share, nor in the same manner; for* Peter *and his Successors the Bishops of* Rome, *have that share which answers to the Head, Root and Fountain; but other Bishops have that share answering to the Branches, Rivolets,* &c.

This glos of *Bellarmines* quite destroyes the Text; for, *Cyprian* compares particular Churches to Branches, Rivolets, Beams; that *one Bishoprick* he compares to an Oak, to Light, to a Fountain, whereby it evidently appears, that by that *one Bishoprick* he means not the Bishoprick of *Rome*, which is a particular Bishoprick, as well as the rest; and not that great Bishoprick, or *one Bishoprick*, whereof every one hath a full share.

Secondly,

Secondly, that by *unus Episcopatus* he means, not the Bishoprick of *Peter*, having authority over other Bishops, is proved by his words in the same Book *de unitate Ecclesiæ*, where he affirms, *Whatever the other Apostles were*, Peter *was the same; that all the Apostles were equal to* Peter, *in dignity and power:* whereby it appears, whatever the Bishoprick of *Peter* was, the Bishopricks of the other Apostles were equal to it; and since the Bishopricks of the other Apostles were particular Bishopricks, each having a full share of that *one Bishoprick* mentioned by *Cyprian*; the Bishoprick of *Peter* was only a particular Bishoprick, and not that *one Bishoprick* mentioned by *Cyprian*.

Thirdly, That the Bishoprick of *Rome* is not that *one Bishoprick*, appears by the expres words of *Cyprian*, in his Oration to the Council of *Carthage*; in which (as we shall prove in the next Chapter) he makes any other Bishop equal in jurisdiction to the Bishop of *Rome*.

Fourthly, *Bellarmine* and *Sanderus*, in making that *one Bishoprick* the Bishoprick of *Peter*, must of necessity grant, that *Peter* only had his Bishoprick immediatly from Christ, and the other Apostles their Bishopricks from *Peter*; since *Sanderus* expresly affirms, that all other Bishopricks flow from the Bishoprick of *Peter*, as all mankind had their Original from *Adam*. But, in averring the Apostles to have their Bishopricks from *Peter*, *Bellarmine* contradicts first *Fran. de victoria*, who, *relect. 2. quæst. 2. conclus. 3.* and 4. expresly affirms, *That the other Apostles received all their power, both of order and jurisdiction, immediatly from Christ.* In which words, he is glossing upon that passage of *Cyprian*, *de unitate Ecclesiæ*, which we now mentioned, *Whatever* Peter *was, the other Apostles were the same, of alike dignity and power with him.* Secondly, *Bellarmine* contradicts himself, because he affirms, *That all the Apostles were made Bishops immediatly by Christ, and had their jurisdiction immediatly from him*, lib. 4.

cap

cap. 23. *de pont. Rom.* and whereas the Church of *Rome* doth diſtinguiſh, that although the other Apoſtles had their Biſhopricks immediatly from Chriſt, yet they had them not *ſecundum plenitudinem poteſtatis*, as *Peter* had his Biſhoprick immediatly from Chriſt: *Fran. de victoria* exſibilats that diſtinction, as contrary to the mind of *Cyprian*, aſſerting an abſolute equality of juriſdiction of all the Apoſtles with *Peter*, *Frau. de victor. ibid.* And thus we have proved, that *Bellarmine* is a bad interpreter of *Cyprian*, in affirming, that *Cyprian* by *unus Epiſcopatus* means, *the Biſhoprick of* Peter, *or his Succeſſor the Biſhop of* Rome.

Now let us examine, how *Bellarmine* comments upon thoſe words of *Cyprian*, *Cujus pars à ſingulis in ſolidum tenetur?* That is, *of which Biſhoprick, every Biſhop hath a full ſhare: Bellarmine* grants, that every Biſhop hath a full ſhare, but denyes they have *an equal ſhare, or in the ſame manner*; he compares that *one Biſhoprick* to a diſſimilar body, *v. g.* to *a Tree*, he compares the Biſhoprick of *Peter* to the *Root*, other Biſhopricks to the *Branches*; for as the Root, although it be a part of the Tree, as are the Branches, yet it ſuſtains and rules the Branches; and therefore, although the Branches have a part of the Tree *in ſolidum*, yet are they not an equal part of the Tree; neither are they a part of the Tree, *in that manner as the root is.* The Root is a part ſuſtaining the Branches, the Branches again are parts ſuſtained and governed by the Root; *So* ſaith *Bellarmine*, *The* Biſhoprick *of* Peter *and his Succeſſors is a part of that* one Biſhoprick *anſwering to the Root, other* Biſhopricks *are parts anſwering to the* Branches, *ruled and ſuſtained by the Biſhoprick of* Peter.

But it is anſwered, *Bellarmine* in this gloſſe, intangles himſelf, firſt in abſurdities, next in contradictions; and firſt, he intangles himſelf in abſurdities, becauſe *Cyprian* expreſly compares that *one Biſhoprick to an Oak, a Fountain, a Light*, which are all ſimilar and homogeneous bodies; of which, every

every part hath the name and nature of the whole; every part of an *Oak is Oak*, every part of a *Fountain of water, is water*, &c. and therefore, *Bellarmine* is absurd in affirming, that *Cyprian* compares that *one Bishoprick to a dissimilar and heterogenious body*; the Sophistry of *Bellarmine* consists in this, what *Cyprian* calls *Robur* or an *Oak*, *Bellarmine* calls it *Arbor*, *or a Tree*; the difference is this, any tree may be considered two wayes, first, as it is an *organick body* consisting of Root and Branches which are dissimilar, organick parts: Secondly, as it is an *homogenius body*, as an Oak, all the parts of which are *Oak*, both Root and Branches, although the Root, be not the Branches; and so *Bellarmine* egregiously sophisticats, in making *Cyprian* compare that *one Bishoprick to a Tree, as it is an organick body*; whereas *Cyprian* compares it to *an Oak*, *as it is a similar body*.

Secondly, the *Whole* cannot be the same with any one *Part*; nor any one *part* the *whole*: *Cyprian* maketh that *one Bishoprick* the *whole*, and every particular Bishoprick *a part*. But *Bellarmine* makes the Bishoprick of *Peter*, and his successors the *whole*, or that *one Bishoprick* mentioned by *Cyprian*; he likewayes makes it a *part*, in shewing, in what manner, comparatively with others, it hath a share of that *one Bishoprick*, which is the *whole*, according to his own confession; and likewayes *a part*, according to his own confession, which is a manifest contradiction.

Thirdly, he adds contradiction to contradiction; for in explaining the way how every Bishoprick hath a share of that *one Bishoprick*, he grants that every *part*, hath a full share, but not an equal share; which is a flat contradiction, since all *full shares* are *equal shares*, neither can any *full share* be more or lesse then an other *full share*. It is true indeed, that one Bishoprick, may be greater in riches, splendor, *&c.* then an other Bishoprick; but they are all alike Bishopricks: Riches, and Poverty hinders not the Episcopal Dignity

and

and Jurisdiction, as is affirmed by *Hieronymus*, in his Epistle to *Enagrius*; where he affirms, that the meanest Bishop, is equally a Bishop with the Bishop of *Rome*, or *Constantinople*, which equality of Bishops is in *essentialls*; for the superiority of an Archbishop, above a Bishop, is in *accidentals*, and was a *non-ens* in the dayes of *Cyprian*; and therefore, he speaks absolutely, without restriction, of the equality of Bishops. And thus we have shewed, with what admirable Sophistry, *Bellarmine* endeavours to wrest the meaning of *Cyprian*; with whose Testimony *Rayinundus Rufus* is so pressed, disputing against *Molinæus*, that he taxeth the saying of *Cyprian* as erronious: because, saith he, *Ulpianus* affirms, *that two persons, cannot have dominion* in solidum *of one thing*; *and therefore* Cyprian *is in an error in affirming, that every Bishop hath a part of that one Bishoprick* in solidum.

But it is answered, *Rufus* is in a mistake, both in the *These* and in the *Hypothese*; he is mistaken in the *These*, because the Lawyers maintain, that more persons may have dominion *in solidum* of one thing, as of *via aquæ ductus*, *or any Comunality*, *as pasturage*, &c. Secondly, he is mistaken in the *Hypothese*: for *Cyprian* is not speaking of the dominion of things; he is only comparing that *one Bishoprick*, *toti similari vel universali*, the part of which *wholes* equally participate their name, and definition, as all men do the humane nature, and all Kings are equally Kings: so saith *Cyprian*, all *Bishops are equally Bishops*.

Turrianus in his defence against *Zadeel lib.* 1. *cap.* 17. grants, that *Cyprian* compares that *one Bishoprick* to a similar body, but yet he affirms, that *Cyprian* is not to be understood literally; otherwayes he cannot be defended from error: because, saith he, *if every Bishop have a part* in solidum *of that* one Bishoprick, *he hath that whole* one Bishoprick: but he is mistaken, in confounding similar with dissimilar bodyes; for, one having the branch of a tree, hath not all the tree: yet

every drop of water hath both the name and definition of the whole Fountain, or is called water, and is water as well as the whole water of the Fountain. Secondly, *Turrianus*, to shun this pretended absurdity, interprets that *one Bishoprick* of *Cyprian* to be the *Church*; likewayes, he interprets those words, *whereof every one hath a full share*, to be, that every one is bound alike to give an account of his administration: but he is mistaken in both those gloses; he is mistaken in the first, because *Cyprian* expresly distinguisheth, that *one Bishoprick* from the Church; for immediatly after those words, *unus Episcopatus est*, &c. *there is one Bishoprick*, &c. he subjoynes, *una quoque est Ecclesia*, &c. *there is one Church*, &c. whereby it appears he speaks of *one Bishoprick and one Church*, as different things: He is likewayes mistaken in his other glos; for it is false which he affirms, that every one is tyed alike to give an account of his administration, since it is notorious, that some are tyed to a stricter account then others.

We will close by instancing one other answer, mentioned by *Chamier*, but he doth not name the Author: the said Author grants, that the meaning of *Cyprian* is, that all Bishops are alike Bishops, but he distinguisheth *quo ad ordinem Sacerdotalem*, and *quo ad Jurisdictionem*, that is *the order of all the Bishops is alike, but not the Jurisdiction*; and therefore, albeit all Bishops be equally Bishops with the Bishop of *Rome*, yet they are not equal with him in Jurisdiction. *Hayus, disput. lib. 1. cap. 12.* gives the same answer, to that passage of *Hieronymus, Epist. 85. ad Euagrium*: we shall discuss that distinction of *Hayus*, in the following Book, to which it properly belongs, as concerning the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, in the interval of Metropolitans: whereas now we dispute only his Supremacy, in the interval of Bishops. It is sufficient for the present to answer, that the said distinction between *Order* and *Jurisdiction* is contrary to the meaning of

Cyprian,

Cyprian; for it ſhall appear in the following Chapter, that any Biſhop is equal in Juriſdiction with the Biſhops of *Rome*, as well as in order, in the opinion of *Cyprian*; becauſe he affirms in his Oration to the Council of *Carthage*, that the Biſhop of *Rome* cannot judge another Biſhop, no more then he can be judged by him: but if that be not an equality in Juriſdiction, there is none at all.

CHAP. VIII.

Some Teſtimonies from Cyprians *Oration in the Council of* Carthage *explained.*

IN the former Chapter we obſerved, by what ſophiſtry our Adverſaries endeavoured to pervert the meaning of *Cyprian* in that famous paſſage, found in his Books *de unitate Eccleſiæ*. But, in ſophiſticating thoſe following teſtimonies of his, uttered in the Council of *Carthage*, their art is admirable. From the ſaid Oration, are gathered the following Teſtimonies: 1. *Neither doth any of us conſtitute himſelf Biſhop of Biſhops, to compell by tyrannical terror his Colleagues to neceſſity of obedience.*

2. *Becauſe every Biſhop, by the licence and liberty of his power, hath his own proper judgement.*

3. *He cannot be judged by another Biſhop, neither can he judge another Biſhop.*

4. *Let us all expect the judgment of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who alone hath power to prefer us, to the Government of the Church, and to judge our actions.*

Theſe famous teſtimonies of *Cyprian* perplexeth the learned men of the Roman Church very much; neither do they agree in their anſwers, as appears by what followeth. When *Luther* in the conference at *Lypſick*, objected thoſe teſtimonies to *Eccius* againſt the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*; *Eccius* anſwered

answered, that *Cyprian* in those words, *no man constitutes himself Bishop of Bishops*, speaks against those only, who without a lawful vocation, obtrudes themselves upon any Church to govern tyrannically: But this answer is naught, because *Cyprian* in those words, is not speaking how Bishops should be constitute? but of the power which constitute Bishops have; as appears not only by those words of *Cyprian* we have cited, but also, by his words uttered after the reading of the Letters of *Jubaianus*, in the Council: The question stated in the Council was, *whether those who were baptised by Hereticks, should be re-baptised? Cyprian*, after the reading of those Letters, and stating of the question, desires every one of them to tell their opinion freely, and not to remove from their communion, those who were of contrary judgement to them: and then he subjoyns those passages we cited in the beginning of the Chapter, *no man constitutes himself Bishop of Bishops*, &c. whereby it is evident, that he speaks of Bishops already constitute, and not of the vocation of Bishops, as *Eccius* affirms.

Sanderus, *lib. 6. cap.* 4. of his *visib. Monarch.* answers diversly, 1. that *Cyprian* speaks so out of humility, since himself in a manner was *Bishop of Bishops*, when he presided several times in a Council: But this answer is nothing worth, for *Cyprian* by *Bishop of Bishops*, means one who takes upon him to compell his Colleagues *to necessity of obedience*, as having Jurisdiction over them: but none will affirm, that he who presides in a Council, hath that power; almost 100. years after *Cyprian*, it was ordained by the 9. Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, that Metropolitans should do nothing without the consent of other Bishops, as inferior Bishops could do nothing without them: much lesse in the times of *Cyprian*, had he who presided in a Council any Jurisdiction above his Colleagues; since in his dayes, there was no Office in the Church

Church above that of a Bishop, as is believed by many learned men: and he who was Bishop *primæ sedis, of the first seat, or chief City of the Province*, was constant President in Provincial Councils, as *Cyprian*, because he was Bishop of *Carthage*; neither had the President of a Council more authority over his fellow Bishops, then the President of a Colledge of Judges, over his fellow Judges.

Sanderus answers, secondly, that *Cyprian* in those words, *no man makes himself Bishop of Bishops*, &c. is only speaking of those Bishops present at the Council of *Carthage*, and means not the Bishops of *Rome* at all; which is also the answer of *Bellarmine, lib. 2. cap. 16. de pont. Rom.* and likewayes of *Pamelius, in his Annotations upon the foresaid place of* Cyprian.

But it is answered, that *Cyprian* is speaking of all Bishops, comprehending the Bishop of *Rome*, as well as other Bishops: his reasons are general, as is evident by his words; *No man* (saith he) *makes himself Bishop of Bishops, because every Bishop hath* proprium arbitrium, that is, *he hath as much authority to utter his judgement as any other, and when his opinion is delivered, no Bishop hath power to compell him to alter it; as he cannot judge another* Bishop, *neither can any other* Bishop *judge him: and therefore, all* Bishops *should expect the judgement of Christ, who* only *can judge their actions.*

Secondly, it is false which they affirm, that *Cyprian* in those expressions, doth not mean by the Bishop of *Rome*; for, *Binius, tom. 1.* in his Annotations upon this Council of *Carthage* affirms, that those words of *Cyprian* were, *tacitè, directed against* Stephanus *Bishop of* Rome. The question agitated in the Council was, *Whether those who were baptized by Hereticks, should be re-baptized? Stephanus* Bishop of *Rome* was for the *negative*, *Cyprian* for the *affirmative*; *Stephanus*, as *Binius* relates, and *Cassander* also, *consult. art.* 37. threatned *Cyprian* and

and the Churches of *Africa* with Excommunication, if they changed not their Opinion: This Council of *Carthage* is called, consisting of eighty seven Bishops; *Cyprian* in his Oration to the Council, affirms, *None of us makes himself Bishop of Bishops, or takes upon him to compell his Colleagues, by tyrannical terrors to necessity of obedience*; which words, as *Binius* observes, were directed against *Stephanus* Bishop of *Rome*; because he had threatned the Bishops of *Africa* with Excommunication, if they did not alter their Judgement.

Sanderus answers thirdly, that albeit *Cyprian* did assert the equality of Bishops in those words: yet, it was only an equality according to their Order of Priesthood, not according to their Jurisdiction: albeit the Bishop of *Rome* be equal to other Bishops, as he is Bishop, yet he is above them in jurisdiction; he gives this answer, *lib. 7. cap.* But it is replyed, this distinction is frivolous, and quite contrary to the meaning of *Cyprian*, whose intention in those words, is expresly to assert the equality of Jurisdiction: and since he aims at the Bishop of *Rome*, it is evident in his opinion, that any Bishop is of equal jurisdiction to the Bishop of *Rome*. How can any be so impudent to deny, that *Cyprian* asserts equality of Jurisdiction? since he expresly affirms, *No Bishop can judge another Bishop, nor be judged by him*; *Christ is the only judge of Bishops*; which in right down terms is, that all Bishops are equal in Jurisdiction, which none but a Sophister will deny.

It is needless to mention the answers of other Romanists, as of *Alanus Copus, lib. 1. cap. 19.* and *Dormanus* in his English Treatise against Bishop *Jewel*, *cap.* 10. since they are not worth the refuting. The most ingenuous answer of them all, is that of *Stapleton*, *lib.* 11. *cap. 7. de princip. fid. doctrin.* where he affirms, that *Cyprian* in those words, to patronize his error, *Utitur verbis errantium*, *and that he seems wonderfully to protect Hereticks* (he means Protestants) *against the Supremacy*

Supremacy of the Biſhop of Rome: he calls thoſe expreſſions o *Cyprian* pernicious, if they be not defended by a commodious Expoſition.

But it is anſwered, the authority of *St. Auguſtine* is of more moment, then the authority of *Stapleton*, who not only commends thoſe expreſſions of *Cyprian*, but alſo recommends them to the whole Church, to be taken notice of as ſo many Oracles, and that in moe places then one, as *lib. 2. cap. 2. lib. 3. cap. 3. lib. 6. cap. 7.* againſt the *Donatiſts*. Further, that *Stephanus* Biſhop of *Rome* himſelf, underſtood thoſe words of *Cyprian* as the Proteſtants do, againſt the juriſdiction of the Biſhop of *Rome*, appears by his excommunicating *Cyprian*, as *Caſſander* relates, *conſult. art. 7.* neither read we ever of his reconciliation, as is confeſſed by *Bellarmine*, *lib. 2. de con. cap. 5.* Neither is it of any moment, what they object, that in that queſtion *of re-baptizing thoſe who were baptized by Hereticks*, the *affirmative* maintained by *Cyprian* was wrong, and the *negative* maintained by *Stephanus* was right: for, the ſtate of the queſtion with the Church of *Rome* in this particular, is, Whether *Cyprian* was for or againſt the Supremacy of the Biſhops of *Rome*? or, whether he did right in oppoſing the uſurpation of *Stephanus*? It ſeems he did, for two reaſons, firſt, becauſe thoſe expreſſions of his were recommended by *St. Auguſtine* to the whole Church: next, becauſe notwithſtanding of his dying excommunicate by *Stephanus*, he was held ever ſince thoſe times to be a Saint and a Martyr, by the Church of *Rome* it ſelf, as he is at this day: whereby it appears, that the ancient Church of *Rome*, immediatly after the times of *Cyprian*, had not much regard to the authority of *Stephanus* his excommunicating *Cyprian*. The truth is, *Cyprian* in that conflict with *Stephanus*, *was a good Patron of an evil cauſe*; and *Stephanus* was *a bad Patron of an good Cauſe*: *Cyprian* was wrong, in maintaining re-baptization of thoſe

who were baptized by Hereticks, but he defended it rightly: *Stephanus*, who maintained the contrary opinion, was right, but maintained it badly, that is, by usurpation, arrogancy and presumption.

CHAP. IX.

Of the contest between Victor *Bishop of* Rome, *and the Bishops of the East.*

WE have in the former Chapters proved, by the testimonies of the Ancients, that the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* was not believed as an Article of Faith, in the dayes of *Cyprian*, nor any time before unto the dayes of the Apostles. We have also shewed, with what perplexed sophistry our Adversaries endeavour to elude the force of those testimonies. In the following Chapters, we will examine what is objected by our Adversaries, to prove the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* in that interval. If it had been an Article of Faith in the Church, that the Bishop of *Rome* was ordained by *Peter*, to succeed to himself in that Function of œcumenick Bishop, or that the Bishop of *Rome* did succeed to *Peter* in that Function, the evidence of that succession had been greater, in these primitive times, then it was afterwards: but contrarily, we find the nearer we come to the Apostles times, the less evidence we find, for the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*: whereby it appears, that the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, by reason of his succession to *Peter*, is but a fiction: neither was it ever urged, as to jurisdiction, till after the Council of *Chalcedon*, as shall appear in the following Books, and the more the times were remote, that opinion of the succession to *Peter* increased the more.

That there was no great evidence before the Council of *Neice*, of the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, is acknowledged

ledged by *Æneas Silvius*, Pope himſelf, in his 288. Epiſtle, and yet he was the greateſt Antiquary of his time: the truth of his aſſertion will appear by our Anſwers to that which they object, which are ſo many teſtimonies againſt themſelves.

To prove the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome* in that interval, they object nothing (beſide what we ſhall prove forged by teſtimony of their own Doctors) before the latter end of the ſecond Age, or beginning of the third; and then their objections are of two ſorts, firſt *actions of Popes*; ſecondly, *teſtimonies of Popes and Fathers*. What regaird ſhould be had to the actions and teſtimonies of Popes, appears by the Commentaries which Pope *Æneas Silvius*, or *Pius* ſecond, wrote upon the Councel of *Baſile*; his words are theſe, *Nec conſiderant miſeri quia quæ prædicant tantopere verba, aut ipſorum ſumorum pontificum ſunt, fimbrias ſuas extendentium, aut illorum quibus adulabantur:* that is, *neither do thoſe miſerable men conſider, theſe teſtimonies they magnifie ſo much are either of Popes themſelves, inlarging their own intereſts, or of their Fathers.* We will firſt treat of the actions of Popes, and next examine their teſtimonies.

Before the time of *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome*, there is no Monument of antiquity for the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome* beſides ſome forgeries, acknowledged by the moſt eminent Doctors of that Church, and proved to be forgeries by unanſwerable reaſons, as ſhall appear afterwards in the laſt Chapters of this Book. The ſaid *Victor*, about *anno*, 195. had a difference with the Biſhops of *Aſia*, about the obſervation of Eaſter, or *Paſch*; the Churches of *Aſia*, pretending a tradition from the Apoſtle *St. John*, obſerved Eaſter, according to the manner of the Jews eating their Paſſover, and for that reaſon, were called *quartadecemani*. The Churches of the Weſt obſerved it, as it is now in the Church of *Rome*: they object here, that *Victor* excomunicated

the Bishops of the East for not observing Easter, after the Roman and western fashion: *Ergo*, say they, the Bishop of *Rome* in those dayes, was œcumenick Bishop; otherwayes, he would not have taken upon him, to exercise Jurisdiction in so remote parts as in *Asia*.

But it is answered, usurpation is no title of authority, and by this very action of *Victor*, it appears, that the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, or necessar communion with the Church of *Rome*, was not believed in those dayes: as appears by two reasons;

The first is, the opposition made by the Churches of *Asia* to that excommunication of *Victor*: but it is altogether impossible that they would have mis-regarded it, if the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, or necessar communion with the particular Church of *Rome*, under the pain of damnation, had been an Article of Faith in those dayes, as it is now. That those Bishops in the East slighted the excommunication of *Victor*, appears by *Eusebius*, *hist. Eccles. lib.* 5. *cap.* 23. and 24. who relates, and brings in *Polycrates*, Bishop of *Ephesus* in *Asia*, pleading their Cause, in an Epistle, written by the consent of them all; *that they had the same tradition, of observing Easter, from the Apostle* John: *that it was practised by* Philip *the Apostle*, Polycarpus *Bishop of* Smyrna, *and* Martyr *disciple of* John *the Apostle*; *and by the other Bishops, and* Martyrs, *as* Thraseas, *and* Sagonius, *that they had confirmed their own way, of observing Easter, in the council of all the Bishops of Asia: and for those reasons, they were not moved, with the terrors of that excommunication, pronounced against them by* Victor: but it is very unlike they would have so contemned it, if they had believed the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*: If there was any such thing, as the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*: their opposition demonstrats, that either they were ignorant of it, or els wilfully opposed

oppoſed it; they could not be ignorant, for who dare affirm, that the Apoſtles *John* and *Philip*, and *Polycarpus* the Diſciple of *John*, could be ignorant of ſo neceſſar a point of Salvation? if there had been any ſuch thing. Neither can it be affirmed, that they wilfully oppoſed it, for it is a thing incredible that ſo many holy men Saints and Martyrs (conteſſed to be ſuch by the modern Church of *Rome* it ſelf) would die out of the communion of the Church of *Rome*, and in ſo doing, condemn themſelves eternally: for *Bellarmine* himſelf, *de pont. Rom. lib.* 2. *cap.* 19. affirms, *that it is not found, that ever* Victor *recalled his excommunication.* And ſince theſe holy men, neither could be ignorant, that the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome* was an article of Faith (if it had been in theſe dayes) neither would they have oppoſed it, and contemned *Victors* excommunication, if they had known it; it is evinced, that in theſe dayes, there was no ſuch article of Faith, as the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, or neceſſar communion with the Church of *Rome*: yea, notwithſtanding of the excommunication of *Victor*, the whole Churches of the Eaſt, before the Council of *Neice*, obſerved Eaſter in their own faſhion: but it were too hard to affirm, that they were all damned; which muſt of neceſſity be affirmed, if the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, had been an article of Faith in thoſe dayes: and this much of oppoſition from the Eaſt, to that decree of *Victor*.

The ſecond Argument taken from that action of *Victor*, againſt the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, is the oppoſition that it had from the Weſt; although the whole Biſhops of the Weſt were of the ſame opinion with *Victor*, anent the obſervation of Eaſter; yet they abſolutely condemned his way of proceeding. For, as *Euſebius* relates, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib.* 5. *cap.* 24. *Irenæus*, Biſhop of *Lyons*, in the name of the whole Churches of *France*, in an Epiſtle to the ſaid *Victor*, (reco.ded

(recorded by *Eusebius, ibid.*) expostulates most bitterly with *Victor*, not obscurely taxing him of ignorance, and arrogance, for his precipitated proceeding, objecting to him, the example of his predecessors, Bishops of *Rome*, as *Pius*, *Telesphorus*, *Anicetus*, &c. who all of them keeped communion with the Bishops of the East, notwithstanding their observation of Easter, otherwayes then it was observed at *Rome*: yea, the same Bishops of the West, still keeped communion with the Bishops of the East, notwithstanding their excommunication by *Victor*: but they would never have done so, if the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, had been believed in those dayes, or if necessar communion with the Church of *Rome*, had in those times been an article of Faith.

Sanderus, *lib.* 7. of his *visib. Monarch.* and with him *Bellarmine*, prove the supremacy of *Victor* in this action by a notable cheat, *the more opposition it had* (saith *Sanderus*) *the authority of* Victor *was the more conspicuous*; *because the Council of* Neice *declared in favour of* Victor, *against all his opposers*; *in decerning that Easter should be observed according to the decree of* Victor.

But it is answered, that the Council did so, not for the authority of *Victor*, but only because they thought that opinion to be right: it was professed by all the Churches of the West, and by *Irenæus*: but *Sanderus* will not affirm, that the Council of *Neice* followed the authority of *Irenæus*. Secondly, albeit the Council had followed the authority of *Victor*, or perswaded by his authority, had made that decree; it doth not follow, that *Victor* had any jurisdiction over the Council, or the whole Church: *Paphnutius* made a motion in the Council of *Neice*, in the defence of married Priests, the Council all followed his opinion, as *Socrates* relates, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 8. of his history of the Church; and yet the said *Paphnutius* had no supremacy over the Council.

Sanderus

Sanderus inſtances, that the Council of *Neice*, in a Letter to the Church of *Alexandria* (mentioned by *Theodoretus*) affirms, that *all the Brethren of the Eaſt are reſolved to follow the Church of* Rome, *us* (the Council) *and you of* Alexandria, *in the obſervation of Eaſter*: where *Sanderus* and *Bellarmine* eſpy out two things for their advantage; the firſt is, *follow*, the ſecond is, that *Romans* is put in the firſt place before *us* (*the Council*) whereby they prove the authority of the Biſhop of *Rome*, above the Council, becauſe *Romans* is put before *the Council*, *or us*, and alſo becauſe the Brethren of the Eaſt are ſaid to *follow the Romans*.

But it is anſwered, albeit *Romans* were put before *us*, or *the Council*, it doth not follow, that the Church of *Rome* hath any authority over the Council: being firſt mentioned in an Epiſtle, doth not import a juriſdiction above another: *Conſtantine* in an Epiſtle (mentioned by *Theodoretus*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 10.) writing of the ſame buſineſs, enumerating a number of Churches, with which theſe Churches of the Eaſt were reſolved in time coming, to obſerve Eaſter; placeth *Spain* before *France*, but it doth not follow, that the Church of *Spain* had any authority over the Church of *France*.

Secondly, *Bellarmine* and *Sanderus*, following the verſion of *Chriſtopherſone*, tranſlates *Theodoretus* falſly, his words in the Original are, ὥστε πάντας τοὺς τῆς ἑῴας ἀδελφοὺς τοὺς πρότερον μὴ ποιοῦντας σύμφωνα τοῖς ῥωμαίοις καὶ ὑμῖν καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐξ ἀρχῆς φυλάττουσι τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τοῦ λοιποῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν ἄγειν; That is, *So that all the Brethren of the Eaſt, who diſſented from the Romans and you, and all thoſe who obſerved Eaſter from the beginning, are reſolved hereafter to obſerve it with you.* The ſophiſtry of *Sanderus* and *Bellarmine* appears in this, inſtead of theſe words, *are reſolved hereafter to obſerve Eaſter with you*, which is the Original, they tranſlate, *they are reſolved hereafter to follow the Roman,*

the

the Council and you, putting in *follow* for *with you*. Secondly, in putting in the *Romans* and the *Council*, which is not in the Original: which words *us* or *the Council*, they insert to prove the authority of the Church of *Rome* above the Council, *Romans* being placed by them before the *Council*. And this much of that contest of *Victor*, with the Bishops of *Asia*, which they produce to prove the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, whereas in effect, it hath disproved it.

Such an other business as this, is that contest of *Stephanus*, Bishop of *Rome*, with *Cyprian*, and the Churches of *Africa*, about the rebaptising of those who were baptised by Hereticks: which they instance also to prove the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, before the Council of *Neice*. But since we shewed, that the excommunication of *Stephanus* was not regarded, that Saint *Augustine* praised the opposition of *Cyprian* to it, and recommended these expressions of *Cyprian*, against the usurpation of *Stephanus* to the whole Church, since 87 Bishops in that Council of *Carthage*, condemned the proceedings of *Stephanus*, since *Cyprian*, dying excommunicated, was reputed nevertheless a Saint by *Augustine*, and other Fathers, and by the ancient Church of *Rome*, and also so reputed by the Modern Church of *Rome*: that Excommunication of *Cyprian* by *Stephanus* is so far from proving, that the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* was an Article of Faith in those dayes, that it demonstrates invincibly the contrary.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Of Appellations, pretended to prove the Supremacy, of the Biſhop of Rome, *in that interval, from the Apoſtles to the death of* Cyprian.

TO theſe actions of Popes uſurping Authority, in that interval, are referred ſeveral pretended Appellations, to the Biſhop of *Rome*, by which they endeavour to prove, his Supremacy in thoſe times: they mention divers, *Bellarmine* makes uſe of three; the firſt is, of the Grand Heretick *Marcion*, who being excommunicated, for his prodigious opinion, by his own Father, a Biſhop in *Pontus*, had his recourſe to *Hyginus*, Biſhop of *Rome*, *anno*, 142. as *Epiphanius* affirms, *Heres.* 42. The ſecond is *Fortunatus*, and *Felix*, being depoſed by *Cyprian* in *Africa*, about *anno*, 252. fled to *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*; as is related by *Cyprians Epiſtle*, 55. The third is a little after the ſame time; *Baſilides*, and *Martialis*, being depoſed by the *Biſhops of Spain*, (as is reported by *Cyprians epiſtle*, 68.) fled to *Stephanus*, Biſhop of *Rome*; of which in order, and firſt of *Marcion*.

This *Marcion*, was a notorious and dangerous Heretick: againſt whom *Tertullian*, and *Epiphanius*, moſt bitterly enveigh: he denied the verity of Chriſts humane nature, and the verity of his ſufferings; he denyed alſo the reſurrection of the body: he maintained, that men might be thrice baptiſed. His Father was a Biſhop or Preacher in *Pontus*, by whom he was excommunicated: he fled to *Rome*, deſiring to be admitted to the communion of that Church; but he was rejected by the Clergy of *Rome*: he asked them a reaſon, they anſwered, *they could not admitt him, without a teſtimonial from his Father the Biſhop, who had excommunicated him*, as is reported by *Epiphanius*. It is very ſtrange, that *Bellar-*

mine should call this an *appellation*, since the Clergy of *Rome* refused to hear him; neither did he appeal at all, as appears, both by the reason wherefore he left his own Countrey, and also by his demands at *Rome*.

The first is related by *Epiphanius*, who tells, he fled from his own Countrey, *not enduring the scoffs of the common people:* his demands at *Rome* are likewayes related by *Epiphanius*, *viz. not to take knowledge in his cause, in a second judgement, which is the demand of Appellants; but only to be admitted to the communion of that Church*; which was also refused him, as is affirmed by *Epiphanius*.

When he was rejected at *Rome*, he associated himself with one *Cerdon*: those two hatched an opinion of *three gods*; *the* first they called *the good God*, *which created nothing at all that is in this world*; the second they called *a visible god*, *Creator of all things*; the third god was the *devil*, whom they made *as a mid-thing*, *between the visible and the invisible god*. *Cerdon* before he was acquainted with *Marcion*, asserted only two gods, the one *author of all good things*, the other *of all evill things*: but after his aquaintance with *Marcion*, they both taught these three gods: this damnable heresie, wounderfully increased in many places; as *Italy*, *Egypt*, *Palestine*, *Arabia*, *Syria*, *Cyprus*, *Persia*, and other places; which caused *Tertullian* and *Epiphanius* inveigh so bitterly against it in their Books.

Bellarmine his second instance of Appellations, is of *Fortunatus* and *Felicissimus*, the story is this; *Felicissimus* and *Novatian* were condemned at a Council of *Carthage*; *Felicissimus* for averring, *that those who had lapsed to Idolatry, in time of persecution, should be admitted to office of the Church, after pen ance: Novation*, for maintaining, *that they might not be admitted to communion at all, no not after pennance:* the Church of *Carthage* takes a midway, decerning, that after

ter pennance they might be admitted to communion, but not to their charge in the Church.

Felicisſimus, who had fallen in Idolatry himſelf, and for that reaſon was debarred from his charge, conſpires with one *Privatus*, who was excommunicated as well as himſelf: they make a faction, and ſets up one *Fortunatus*, Biſhop of *Carthage*, in oppoſition to *Cyprian*; and immediatly goes to *Rome*, deſiring of *Cornelius*, Biſhop of *Rome*, to be admitted to communion with that Church, deſiring him to countenance their new Biſhop *Fortunatus*. *Cornelius* refuſes at firſt, to hear them; but afterwards they uſe Menaces; whereupon he writes to *Cyprian* his intimate friend. in their favour.

It is demanded of *Bellarmine*, how he finds any Appellation here? The cauſe is almoſt the ſame with that of *Marcion*, which we now mentioned, yea, *Pamelius* himſelf in his Annotations, upon that place of *Cyprian*, denyes expreſly there was any appellations, but that theſe went to *Rome*, to complain, or to be judged, not in thoſe things in which they had been already judged by *Cyprian*, but in other things.

Secondly, albeit there had been any appellations, it was oppoſed by *Cyprian*, for two reaſons; firſt, *becauſe delinquents ſhould be judged where the crime is committed where witneſſes may be had againſt them.* Secondly, *becauſe the authority of the Biſhops in* Africa *was no leſs, (who had already judged them) then the authority of the* Biſhop *of* Rome, *to whom they had their recourſe.*

Bellarmine anſwers to both theſe reaſons; to the firſt he gives a twofold anſwer, firſt, that the meaning of *Cyprian* is to be underſtood *de prima inſtantia*, that is, perſons ſhould be judged where the crime is committed, the firſt time only; but if they appeal, they ſhould be judged in that place, to which they appeal. But he Sophiſticates, for *Cyprian* is

opposing a second judgement at *Rome*, after they had been condemned in *Carthage*, as is notorious by the History.

Bellarmine answers, Secondly, that *Cyprian* is against a second judgement or appellation, *when the crime is manifest, and not when it is dubious.* But it is replyed, that manifest or unmanifest crime doth not take away appellation, if the appellation be otherwayes legal, or if the Judge to whom they appeal, have jurisdiction over him, from whom they have appealed: Neither doth *Cyprian* distinguish, between *manifest* and *not manifest crimes at all.* Secondly, *Bellarmine* contradicts himself, in affirming, that the meaning of *Cyprian* is that they may appeal to *Rome*, when the cause is dubious, but not when it is manifest; which distinction *Bellarmine* admits, *viz.* that there should be no appellation when the crime is manifest; and yet in this case of *Fortunatus*, and *Felix*, the crimes were manifest: and *Bellarmine* instances their appellations as legal, which is a flat contradiction: and this much of *Bellarmines* answer to *Cyprians* first reason, *viz.* That *Crimes should be judged where they are committed.*

He yet instances, that if that reason of *Cyprians* were valid, it would cut off all appellations, *for there can be no appeal, if crimes be judged where they are committed.* But it is replyed, that Cyprian *adds, when the authority of those who have already judged them, is no less then the authority of those to whom they appeal*; for immediatly after those words, *crimes should be judged where they are committed*, he restricts his meaning by the comparison of authority, *except* (saith he) *the authority of the Bishops of* Africa, *be thought not sufficient by those profligate fellows who were judged by them.*

Bellarmine

Bellarmine inſtances, thoſe words of *Cyprian*, are not comparing the authority of the Biſhops of *Africa*, with the authority of the Biſhop of *Rome*: but only, with the cauſe of *Fortunatus*, and *Felix*: that is, the authority of the Biſhop in *Africa*, is ſufficient to judge that caſe: but it is anſwered, although that were the meaning of *Cyprian*, it cutts off all appellations to *Rome*: for if the authority of the Biſhops of *Africa*, be ſufficient in that caſe of *Fortunatus* and *Felix*, they cannot be rejudged at *Rome*, in a ſecond judgement. Secondly, albeit *Cyprian* for modeſties ſake, doth not name the authority of the Church of *Rome*, in the compariſon: (for he was a great reſpecter of *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*) yet, that this is his meaning, appears more evidently by thoſe ſpeeches of his, uttered againſt *Stephanus* Biſhop of *Rome* afterward, in an other Council of *Carthage*, which we mentioned in the former Chapter; where he expreſly affirms, that all Biſhops, *are of a like juriſdiction*: And this much of *Bellarmine*. *Pamelius* anſwers this paſſage of *Cyprian* otherwayes, with a world of Sophiſtry.

And firſt he affirms, that *Cyprian* in thoſe words, is not diſputing againſt a ſecond judgement at *Rome*, but againſt a judgement at *Rome*, in the caſe of *Fortunatus*, and *Felix in prima inſtantia*; and therefore he uſes theſe words, *the crime ſhould be judged where it is committed*; alluding to an Epiſtle Decretal of *Fabianus* Biſhop of *Rome*, in which it is expreſly ordained, *that no Biſhop ſhould be judged at* Rome, *per Saltum*, *that is*, *until he be firſt judged*, *where he is accuſed to have tranſgreſſed*. So if ye object to *Pamelius*, that *Fortunatus* and *Felix*, were already judged in *Africa*, and went to *Rome* to demand a ſecond hearing: he anſwers, they did not demand a recognoſcing of theſe things, for which they had been already judged; but deſired of *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*, that he would be judge in things afterward laid to their

their charge by the Biſhops of *Africa*, which were not yet judged by them. But it is replyed, it is falſe, that *Pamelius* affirms, for it appears expreſly by *Cyprians* Letter, that he diſputes againſt a ſecond judgment at *Rome*, and not a judgement in *Prima inſtantia*; whereas *Pamelius* affirms, that new crimes were intended, which had not been yet judged: it is his bare aſſertion, neither brings he any proof of it; for if any ſuch thing had been, a judgement *in prima inſtantia* could not have been with any ſhadow of juſtice countenanced at *Rome*: neither could *Feliciſſimus* be ſo ignorant, as to expect any redreſs that way; the Scope of *Feliciſſimus* complaint was, that he and *Fortunatus* might be reſtored, becauſe the judgement of the *African* Biſhops paſſed againſt them was unjuſt.

Pamelius inſtances ſecondly, that it was a firſt judgement or in *prima inſtantia*, which *Feliciſſimus* demanded at *Rome*, or elſe it was an appellation; ſeing there can be no mids, but there is no mention made of appellation at all by *Cyprian*, *Ergo*, it was a judgement in *prima inſtantia* which they demanded at *Rome*; and for which *Cyprian* ſo much expoſtulats with *Cornelius*, and inveighs againſt them.

It is anſwered firſt, how this paſſage of *Cyprian* puzles them, appears by their contradictions in their gloſſes: *Bellarmine* inſtances this particular of *Feliciſſimus*, as an appellation, to prove the juriſdiction of the Biſhop of *Rome*, over the Biſhops in *Africa*: *Pamelius* flatly denys, that *Feliciſſimus* appealed at all; which is a flat contradiction of *Bellarmine*: he takes this courſe, perceiving, that if this particular of *Feliciſſimus* were an appellation, *Cyprian* muſt of neceſſity be againſt the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*; ſince he expreſly diſputs, that *Feliciſſimus* cannot be judged at *Rome*, and conſequently *Pamelius* confeſſeth, that *Bellarmines* evaſions are nothing to the purpoſe.

It

It is anſwered, ſecondly, (whereas *Pamelius* diſputes *Feliciſſimus* did not appeal, *Ergo* he demanded a judgement *in prima inſtantia*) it doth not follow, becauſe there is a mids: *Feliciſſimus* did make no appeal, when he came out of *Africa*, neither deſired he a ſecond judgment at *Rome*, as it had been a formal appeal: but only deſired, the aſſiſtance of *Cornelius*, that by his moyen he might have ſome redreſs: that this is no *evaſion*, appears by two unanſwerable reaſons; the firſt is this,

Cyprian in his 55 Epiſtle affirms, that they had ſolicited the Biſhops in *Africa*, before ever they had ſolicited the Biſhop of *Rome*, making the ſame complaints: but none will affirm, that they appealed to thoſe Biſhops of *Africa*, after they had been condemned by the Council of *Carthage*, over which the Biſhops of *Africa* had no authority; in which doing they followed the example of *Privatus*, who after he was condemned both in the Council of *Africa* and at *Rome* by *Cornelius* himſelf, yet he deſired a ſecond judgement, in another Council in *Africa*, whereby it is evident, that a ſecond judgement in thoſe dayes, did not infer of neceſſity, a formal appellation, ſince there could be no appellation from a Synod to its ſelf: neither will *Bel armine* affirm, that *Privatus* appealed from *Cornelius* to a Council in *Africa*.

The ſecond reaſon proving a mids between an Appeal and a judgement in *prima inſtantia*, is this: we have proved, that *Feliciſſimus* did not demand a judgement in *prima inſtantia* from *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*; but neither did he appeal unto him for an Appealer is held *Pro non judicato or not guilty*, till the appeal be diſcuſſed; but ſo was not *Feliciſſimus*, for all held him guilty in *Africa*, and refuſed communion with him: neither did *Cornelius* admit him to his communion at *Rome*, after he was condemned by the Council of *Carthage*: neither did

did *Cornelius* judge in his cauſe at all, but only wrote unto *Cyprian* to deal favourably with him. Since then, *Cyprian* diſputed ſo vehemently, that *Cornelius* ſhould not meddle in that caſe of *Feliciſſimus*, after the determination of the Council of *Carthage*; much more he would have oppoſed the authority of *Cornelius*, if there had been any formal appellation: and all what *Bellarmine* and *Pamelius* alledge to the contrary, is proved ſophiſtry, the one contradicting the other, and this much of *Fortunatus* and *Felliciſſimus*.

The third example of Appellations (in this interval before the Council of *Neice*) inſtanced by *Bellarmine*, is this. *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome* dying, *Lucius* ſucceeds; but he not living long, *Stephanus* ſucceeds, in whoſe time the Biſhops of *Spain* excommunicat *Baſilides* a Biſhop, and likewayes one *Martialis*, for falling in Idolatry, or ſacrificing to Idols, in the time of perſecution, for fear of torture, or death: *Baſilides* becomes penitent, demands abſolution, which they grant him; but withal, they refuſe to reſtore him to his Biſhoprick, in which they put another called *Sabinus*. *Baſilides* and *Martialis* have their recourſe to *Stephanus* Biſhop of *Rome*; he takes not ſo much notice of *Martialis*, but he writes to the Biſhops of *Spain* to reſtore *Baſilides* to his place: they conſult the Biſhops of *Africa*, who meeting in a Council about the buſineſs, the Biſhops of *Africa* ſend their opinion in an Epiſtle (which in the edition of *Turnebius* is *Epiſt.* 35. in that of *Pamelius*, 68. of *Cyprian*) in which Epiſtle, *Cyprian* inveighs againſt *Baſilides* as an Impoſtor, taxeth *Stephanus* of credulity, in giving ear to *Baſilides*, and concludes, that the deſire of *Stephanus* ſhould not be obeyed, ſince *Sabinus was legally put in the place of* Baſilides, *and therefore they ought to maintain him in that* Biſhoprick.

Here *Bellarmine* is demanded, what he ſees in this Hiſtory making for the juriſdiction of the Biſhop of *Rome* over the Biſhop

Bishops of *Spain*? or for proving that *Basilides* appealed formally? It would seem, that *Basilides* appealed not, since he was held *pro judicato excommunicated, deposed,* and another put in his Bishoprick; which could not have been done, if Appeals to *Rome* had been believed obligatory in those dayes. Secondly, *Cyprian* and the Council of *Africa* advise the Bishops of *Spain*, not to obey the desire of *Stephanus* in rescinding the ordination of *Sabinus*, affirmed by them to be legal (*Jure ordinata*) but if *Basilides* had appealed, the ordination of *Sabinus* had not been lawful; whereby it is evident, that no appeals to *Rome* were approved in those dayes, albeit *Basilides* had appealed.

Bellarmine answers, that *Basilides* did appeal, because he had his recourse to *Stephanus*, and complained: But it is replyed, first, that was no appeal, because he made no intimation of it to the Bishops of *Spain*, before he went to *Rome*. Secondly, because his going to *Rome*, did not hinder or suspend the execution of the sentence passed against him, as appears by the placing of *Sabinus* in his Bishoprick in the *interim*. Thirdly, when he came to *Rome*, he brought no probations with him, but only as *Cyprian* affirms, *Stephanum longe positum & rei gestæ ignarum fefellit*; that is, *he deceived* Stephanus *Bishop of* Rome, *altogether ignorant of the business*. Lastly, if *Basilides* had appealed, the Bishops of *Spain* had been cited to plead the cause at *Rome*, which they were not, whereby it is evident there was no appeal.

Secondly, to prove the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome*, *Bellarmine* alledgeth, that *Stephanus* commanded the Bishops of *Spain* to repone *Basilides*, and rescind that ordination they had made in favour of *Sabinus*. But it is answered (to omit, we shewed it was no formal sentence of *Stephanus*, but only an advice) *Bellarmine* forgets the other half of the tale, quite destroying the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*; as first, that

the Biſhops of *Spain* (before they gave an anſwer to *Stephanus*) conſulted with the Biſhops of *Africa*, whereby it is evident, they acknowledged not the juriſdiction of the Biſhops of *Rome*. Secondly, the Biſhops of *Africa*, meeting in a Council, adviſes them not to obey the deſire of *Stephanus*, in reſcinding their ordination of *Sabinus*, becauſe it was *Rite peracta, or legal*, and conſequently *Stephanus* had no authority to command them. Thirdly, becauſe the Biſhops of *Spain* did not obey the deſire of *Stephanus*, at leaſt it is not found in any monument of Antiquity, that ever *Baſilides* was reſtored.

Bellarmine inſtances, that *Stephanus* would never have taken it upon him, to cognoſce in the cauſe of *Baſilides*, if it had not belonged to him: But it is anſwered, firſt, he did not cognoſce formally in it at all, as we ſhewed. Secondly, albeit he had, it was only an uſurpation, which is no title of the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*. We do not affirm that *Stephanus* had not ſo much arrogancy, ſince he declared he had, as appears by his proceeding with the Churches of *Africa*, mentioned in the former Chapter: we only affirm, that he did not cognoſce formally in this caſe of *Baſilides*, but only delt by way of perſwaſion: and although he had done ſo, it is no Argument for the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, as an Article of Faith in thoſe dayes; ſince it was everywhere oppoſed, as we proved by that paſſage of *Victor*, with the oriental Biſhops, and of *Stephanus* with *Cyprian*, and this of *Stephanus* with the Biſhops of *Spain*: by which paſſages it appears, that the decrees of the Biſhop of *Rome* were oppoſed in all the Eaſt, in *France*, in *Africa*, in *Spain*, that is, almoſt by the whole Church. And this much of appellations to *Rome*, before the dayes of *Cyprian*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

The teſtimonies of Ignatius, Irenæus *and* Tertullian, *objected to prove the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of* Rome, *before the times of* Cyprian, *examined.*

IN the two former Chapters, we anſwered all what the Learned Romaniſts could pretend, to prove the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, before the midle of the third Century, by uſurpations of Biſhops of *Rome* and appellations: They next endeavour to prove it by teſtimonies of Fathers, which are of two ſorts; 1. *wreſted*; 2. *forged*. In this Chapter and the next following, we will examine the firſt ſort; and then we will conclude this Book, with examining the laſt. The Fathers, whoſe teſtimonies they wreſt, are either Greek, or Latin: The Greek Fathers are *Ignatius*, and *Irenæus*; the Latin Fathers, by them alledged are, *Tertullian*, and *Cyprian*: We will ſpeak of the Greek Fathers, and alſo of *Tertullian* in this Chapter, and will anſwer theſe teſtimonies of *Cyprian* in the Chapter next following. And firſt of *Ignatius*, from whom they alledge the inſcription of his Epiſtle written to the Romans, which is this, *Ignatius to the Sanctified Church preſiding in the region of the* Romans; thus the place is alledged by *Bellarmine*, whereas the Greek hath ἡ τις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου ῥωμαίων; that is, *which preſides in the place of the region of the* Romans: wherefore they render it ſo? this is the reaſon; *Baronius ad annum.* 45 *num.* 10. obſerves, that the *Roman Church*, and the *Catholick Church* were believed to be the ſame; and therefore, they tranſlate *Ignatius*, affirming the Church of *Rome*, *to Preſide in the region of the* Romans, that is (ſaith *Bellarmine* and *Bozius*) *Preſiding in the Catholick Church.*

But it is answered, first, that it was not the custom, in the dayes of *Ignatius*, to call the *Roman-church*, the *Catholick-church*: or where they spake of the *Roman-church*, to mean by it the *Catholick-church*: first, because the oldest testimony we have of that kind, is in the dayes of *Theodosius junior*, *Victor Uticensis*, and *Gregorius Turonensis*: that is, not till 300. years after *Ignatius*; and 400. after *Christ*. Secondly, that maner of phrase had its Original from the *Arians*; the said *Gregorius Turonensis*, in his Book, *De gloria martyrum, cap.* 25. brings in an *Arian Prince*, calling the *Orthodox-church*, *the Roman-church*; or *Orthodox-christians*, *Romans*. Thirdly, that maner of speaking had its Original, from a politick reason; and not from an Eccleſiastical: In those dayes the *Goths*, *Alans*, and *Vandals* made war upon the Romans; the first three were *Arians*, the Romans *Orthodox*: and therefore, because all the Orthodox Christians partied the Romans in that war, they called them all *Romans*; their *Faith*, the *Roman Faith*; their Church the *Roman Church*: as the *Turks* at this day, call all Christians *Francks*, or *French-men*. Fourthly, as we said, they translate *Ignatius* falsly; for his words are, *to the Church presiding in Loco, regionis Romanorum, in the place of the region of the Romans*: whereby it evidently appears, that the meaning of *Ignatius* is no other, then the *Church presiding in the Town of* Rome; since none can affirm by these words, he means otherwayes, or that the Church of *Rome* presides in the whole Church; since he particularizes the presidency, and restricts it to a certain place, *of the region of the Romans*: and therefore, they sophisticate egregiously, in translating *Ignatius*, *Presiding in the region of the Romans*. Since the Romans (say they) at that time commanded the whole world, *Ignatius* by a Church *Presiding in the region of the Romans*, understands a Church *Presiding in the whole world*; whereas the words

words of *Ignatus* impart no more, but a Church preſiding *in a certain place, of the region of the Romans.* Which is further confirmed, becauſe we ſhewed before, from theſe two Epiſtles of *Ignatius* to the *Trallians*, and *Magneſians*, that he acknowledged no Office in the Church, above that of a Biſhop: but he could not be ſo forgetful of himſelf, as in this Epiſtle, to acknowledge the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, as *Bellarmine* and *Bozius* pretends he doth; which is further confirmed, by the teſtimony of *Baſilius* Epiſts 8. where he affirms, that *Iconium preſides in a part of Piſidia*, which is juſt ſuch an other expreſſion as that of *Ignatius.*

We could defend the meaning of *Ignatius*, not to make much for them, although they had tranſlated him faithfully; that is, if he had ſaid *Preſiding in the region of the Romans:* for, from theſe words it can no more be gathered, that the Biſhop of *Rome* is œcumenick Biſhop, then it can prove the Biſhop of *Ments*, or the Biſhop of *Carthage*, œcumenick Biſhop; becauſe they *preſide in the region of Carthage*, &c. for in the dayes of *Ignatius*, as we ſaid, none were called *Romans*, but thoſe who lived within the precinct, or particular command of the City: and this much of *Ignatius.*

Now followeth *Irenæus*, from whom they bring a teſtimony by them much magnified; the paſſage is this, ſpeaking of the Church of *Rome*, *ad hanc enim eccleſiam, propter potentiorem principalitatem, neceſſe eſt omnem convenire eccleſiam, hoc eſt eos qui ſunt undique, fideles, in qua Semper ab his qui Sunt undique conſervata eſt ea, quæ ab Apoſtolis eſt traditio.* The ſubſtance is, *all Churches ſhould accord with the Church of* Rome, *for two reaſons, firſt, becauſe of its more powerful principality; the next is, becauſe Apoſtolical tradition is preſerved in that Church.* But this place makes not much for them, as appears by *Irenæus* ſcope; this paſſage is found,

lib.

lib. 3. cap. 13. in which Chapter he is disputing against *Hereticks*; which were the perfect Scriptures? he willeth them for their satisfaction, to consult with the ancient Churches, which successively descended from the Apostles: and for instance sake, proponeth unto them the *Church of Rome*; his meaning is then, in those words, *whatever the Church of* Rome *at that time thought perfect Scriptures, all Churches about were bound to acknowledge them for such*; first, by reason of its more *powerful principality*, that Church being founded by the Apostles *Paul* and *Peter* (as was believed then) Secondly, because it hath been thought by Churches about *to have purely preserved that tradition of the Canon of Scripture, which it had received from the Apostles*: so that the meaning of *Irenæus* is no other then this, *that all are bound to accord to that Church, so long as it preserves the perfect Canon of Scripture, and teaches no other Doctrine then is contained in it*, by this testimony of *Irenæus*, we are bound no more to adhere to the Church of *Rome*, then it adhereth to the Scripture.

But they instance, *Irenæus* simply, without such restrictions, *affirms, that all should accord to the Church of* Rome, *because it observes the apostolick tradition*; which is as much, say they, as the Church of *Rome* cannot make an Apostacy. But it is replyed, first, although *Irenæus* affirmed, that in those times, *the Church of* Rome *preserved the pure Canon of the Scripture*; yet, he doth not affirm, that in all times coming it would do so. The Church of *Rome* at this day, observes not that Cannon of the Scripture, which was observed in the dayes of *Irenæus*; the Council of *Trent*, under the pain of an *Anathema* adds to the Canon of the Scriptures, these Books commonly called *Apocrypha*, which were rejected by the Church of Rome, in the dayes of *Irenæus*, as shall be proved in its own place, by the testimonies of the most eminent Doctors

of

of the Roman Church; to omit the teſtimonies of almoſt all the Fathers, by whoſe teſtimonies it ſhall be proved, that in the dayes of *Irenaus*, the Churches of *Rome*, *Aſia*, *Africa*, *Egypt*, &c. rejected thoſe Books canonized by the Council of *Trent*: and therefore, they muſt of neceſſity affirm, that either the Modern Church of *Rome*, or the Council of *Trent*, excommunicates all theſe, who accord with the Church of *Rome*, in the Canon of the Scripture, in the dayes of *Irenaus*: or elſe they have made a defection themſelves, from that Church, which was in the dayes of *Irenaus*: The Council of *Trent* makes thoſe Books Canonical, with an *Anathema* to thoſe who ſhall not acknowledge them for ſuch, but the Church of *Rome*, in the dayes of *Irenaus*, rejected them as *Apocryphal*, as is proved by the teſtimonies of *Ruffinus in Symbulo apud Cyprianum, and Hieronymus in his preface upon the Books of the Kings*, and *prologo Galeato, tom.* 3. That all other Churches accorded with the Church of *Rome*, in that Canon of the Scriptures, is proved by an induction of them all: as the eaſt Church, as is teſtified by *Melito*, the Church of *Jeruſalem*; as is teſtified by *Cyril*, of *Alexandria*, witneſſe *Athanas* and *Origen*, of *France*; as is teſtified by *Hilarius*, of *Aſia*, *Concil. Loadicenum*, of *Conſtantinople*; *Nazianz.* and *Damaſcen.* Theſe teſtimonies are acknowledged by *Bellarmine* himſelf for the moſt part, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 20. *de verbo Dei.*

Secondly, that *Irenaus* in theſe words, means no other *according with the Church of* Rome, then in as far as it preſerves the truth, appears further, not only by his keeping communion with the Biſhops of the Eaſt, notwithſtanding of their excommunication by *Victor*; but likewayes by his ſharply rebuking of *Victor*, taxing him of Ignorance, and Arrogance, for his proceeding in ſuch a manner: by which it evidently appears, that neceſſar communion with the Church

Church of *Rome* was no article of faith in the opinion of *Irenæus*, much less the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, and this much of *Irenæus*.

Now we come to the Latine Fathers; the first passage alledged is of *Tertullianus de pudicitia*, where he calls *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*, *Bishop of Bishops*: But it is answered, first, albeit he did so, it proves not *Victor* was œcumenick Bishop; because we read that *James* is so called by *Clement*. *Lupus* is so called by *Sidonius*, *lib. 6. epist. 1.* *Marcus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, is called also *Bishop of Bishops*, by *Theodorus Balsamon*, in his answers to the Interrogations of the said *Marcus*: but *Bellarmine* will not affirm, that *James*, or *Lupus*, or *Marcus* were œcumenick Bishops.

Secondly, *Tertullian* in that place, calling *Victor Bishop of Bishops*, doth so *Ironicè* or in *mockery*, as appeares by the occasion of his calling him so, which was this: *Victor* made a decree of admitting fornicators or whoremongers too easily to the communion of the Church, in the opinion of *Tertullian*. Speaking of that decree, *Tertullian* affirms, *Episcopus Episcoporum nuper edidit Edictum*, &c. *The Bishop of Bishops hath now put forth an Edict*, and falls too immediatly and disputes against it: whereby it appears, that he did not acknowledge the supremacy of *Victor*: that he is mocking him, appears further, by his calling that decree of *Victor*, *Edictum*, an *edict*, but Emperours only set forth *Edicts*, and so he calls *Victor Bishop of* Bishops, in the same sence that he calls *his decree an Edict*, which none can deny to be in mockery.

They alledge another passage from *Tertullian* in his *prescript. 76.* against hereticks; this passage is objected by *Pamelius*, and is this, *If ye live in the adjacent places to* Italy, *ye have* Rome, *from whence we have also Authority*. *Tertullian* himself then lived in *Africa*, whence they conclude from

from theſe words *we have Authority*, that the Biſhop of *Rome* had Juriſdiction in *Africa* in the opinion *Tertullian*. But it is anſwered, this place reſembles very much that of *Irenæus*, which we now diſcuſſed; his ſcope in theſe words, is to arme his Readers againſt hereſies; among other preſcriptions, he preſcribs this fore one, that all ſhould ſtrive to inform themſelves what is the Doctrine of thoſe Churches which were founded by the Apoſtles, and then to conform themſelves to that Doctrine. And firſt, ſaith he, *If ye live in* Achaia *conſult the Church of* Corinth; *if ye live not far from* Macedonia, *conſult the Church of* Philippi, *and* Theſſalonica; *if ye live in* Aſia, *conſult the Church of* Epheſus; *if ye live in the adjacent parts to* Italy, *follow the Church of* Rome; *from which* (ſaith he) *we alſo in* Africa *have our authority*, becauſe it is the neareſt Apoſtolick Church. Obſerve, he calls *Apoſtolick Churches* thoſe who were founded by the Apoſtles themſelves, as that of *Philippi*, *Corinth*, *Theſſalonica* by *Paul*, that of *Epheſus* by *St. John*, that of *Rome* by *Peter* and *Paul*: whence it is eaſie to conjecture, what is the meaning of *Tertullian*: for by theſe words, *from whence we have our Authority*, it follows no more, that the Church of *Rome* hath juriſdiction in *Africa*, then it follows, that the Church of *Epheſus*, or *Antiochia* have juriſdiction over all *Aſia*; or, that the Church of *Corinth* hath juriſdiction over all *Achaia*. His meaning then aſſuredly is, that albeit one be not under the juriſdiction of the neareſt Apoſtolick Church; yet it is the ſureſt way, to preſerve your ſelf from Hereſie, to follow the Faith of that Church, becauſe it is moſt like, that thoſe Churches, who were founded by the Apoſtles themſelves, are leaſt obnoxious to defection.

Secondly, that *Tertullian* did not dream of any such thing as the infalibity of the Church of *Rome*, or supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, as a necessar article of faith, appears, not only by his disputing expresly against that decree of *Victor*, Bishop of *Rome*, which we now mentioned; but also, by several other passages of *Tertullian*, in the said prescriptions, and else where. *Beatus Rhenanus* in his Argument to the same book of *Tertullian*, *de prescrip.* printed at *Basil*, *anno.* 1521. (which *Rhenanus* was a Popish Doctor, and exqu sitly versed in the Writings of the Fathers, and especially of *Tertullian*, upon whom he commented) hath these expressions; *Tertullian*, (saith he) *doth not confine the Chatholick Church to the Church of* Rome, *he doth not esteem so highly of the Church of* Rome, *as they do now a dayes*; *he reckoneth her with other Churches*, *and admonisheth his Reader to enquire, as well what milk the Church of* Corinth *gave, as that of* Rome: In which words, he means the same very passage of *Tertullian* which we now explained, and vindicated from the Sophistry of *Pamelius:* at last he concludes, *if* Tertullian *were now alive, and should say so much, he could not escape unpunished*; and this much *Rhenanus* avouched, when he had the use of his tongue: but the *index, expurgatorius belgicus, pag.* 78. has gagged his mouth with a *deleantur hec verba*, and so they are not now found in the Editions of *Rhenanus*, printed since in those places, where the Pope hath jurisdiction. They had reason to purge out those words from *Rhenanus*, because the testimony of his was as a Poyniard, sticking in the very bowels of that article of the Catechise of the Council of *Trent*, viz. *that there is no salvation without communion with the Church of* Rome

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Several paſſages objected out of Cyprian, *to prove the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of* Rome, *in that interval; vindicated from Sophiſtry.*

THe laſt Father they make uſe of, to prove the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, in that interval, between the times of the Apoſtles, and the death of *Cyprian*, is *Cyprian* himſelf. There is not a Father of them all more urged, to prove the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, then *Cyprian*; and yet it is moſt certain, that it never had a greater enemy then he: what *Cyprians* opinion was anent that conteſt, appeared in the former Chapters, both by his teſtimonies, and his actions: Our adverſaries diſpute two wayes for the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, out of *Cyprian*: firſt by ſophiſtry, next by forgery: we will refute the firſt in this Chapter, and prove the ſecond in the Chapters following; and that by the teſtimonies of the greateſt Antiquaries, that ever the Church of *Rome* produced.

The firſt teſtimony of *Cyprian*, they bring is, from his 42. Epiſtle, where writing to *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*, he hath theſe words, *Some while ago, we ſent ſome of our Colleagues to compoſe ſome differences, or to reduce ſome ſchiſmaticks to the unity of the Chatholick Church*, &c. and a little after *But thoſe Schiſmaticks ſet up to themſelves an adulterous head againſt the Church*; from which place, *Bellarmine* reaſons thus, *as thoſe Novatians ſet up one to be head of their Church*, or of the whole Church of the Novatians; *ſo Cornelius was head of the Catholick Church.*

But it is anſwered, this reaſoning is very unbeſeeming ſuch a learned man as *Bellarmine*: for the meaning of *Cyprian* is no other, then that the Novatians ſet up to themſelves a

Biſhop at *Rome*, in oppoſition to *Cornelius*; ſo he calls the Novatian Biſhop, *an adulterous head, contrary to* Cornelius, who was the true head of the particular Church at *Rome*, becauſe he was the true Biſhop thereof: and ſo *Cyprian* doth not mean any *head of the whole Church*, but only by *Head*, he means Biſhop of the particular Church of *Rome*.

Bellarmine inſtances, that *Cyprian* affirms, *his intention was to reconcile thoſe Shiſmaticks to the Catholick Church; by which he means the Church of* Rome, *and ſince the Church of* Rome *is the Catholick Church, and the Biſhop of* Rome *head of the Church of* Rome, Ergo, *he is head of the Catholick Church.*

But it is anſwered when *Cyprian* calls the Church of *Rome* the *Catholick Church*, his meaning is a *particular Church profeſſing the Doctrine of the Catholick Church*; and therefore, they who were reconciled to the Church of *Rome*, were reconciled to the Catholick Church alſo: ſo any reconciled to a particular Church, profeſſing the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, is reconciled alſo to the Catholick Church, and yet that particular Church is not the *Catholick Church*. That this is the meaning of *Cyprian*, appears, by the preceeding Epiſtle, or *epiſt.* 41. where ſpeaking of ſome Schiſmaticks in the Church of *Carthage*, he affirms they oppoſed themſelves to the *Catholick Church*: he means, they oppoſed themſelves to the Church of *Carthage*, inwhich doing, they oppoſed themſelves to the *Catholick Church*; becauſe the Church of *Carthage*, profeſſed the ſame Doctrine, with the *Catholick Church*, in oppoſing or renting the Church of *Carthage*, they rent and oppoſed the *Catholick Church*.

Pamelius, urgeth, that *Cyprian* affirms, that thoſe Schiſmaticks refuſed the boſome of the *root and mother Church*: where obſerve, ſaith he, that *Cyprian* calls the Church

Church of *Rome*, the *root and the mother of all Churches, or of the Catholick Church*, which Epithet is given by *Cyprian* to the Church of *Rome*, not only in this epiſtle, but alſo in his 45. *epiſt* to *Cornelius*: in which he gives injunctions to thoſe he was ſending to *Rome*, (to be informed concerning that ſchiſm of the *Novatians*) that they ſhould acknowledge and adhere to the *Root and Mother of the Catholick Church*.

But it is anſwered, that *Cyprian* by *Root and Mother of the Catholick Church*, means no other thing, but the *Catholick Church it ſelf*, as appears by the ſaid 45. Epiſtle; in which he affirms to *Cornelius*, that hearing that there was a ſchiſm in the Church of *Rome*, he ſent *Caldonius* and *Fornatus*, to be informed of the truth of the buſineſs, and to adhere to neither party, till they were informed which of the factions was in the right? and which in the wrong? and for that reaſon, he did not direct his Letters, either to *Cornelius*, or to that *Novatian Biſhop*; but only to the *Preſbyters* and *Deacons* of *Rome*, that being informed by them, they might adhere to thoſe, who held and acknowledged the *Root and Mother of the Catholick Church*: whereby it is evident, that *Cyprian* did not believe, that *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*, or thoſe who adhered to him, were the *root and mother of the Catholick Church*, ſince he gave his meſſengers injunction, to ſuſpend their Judgments, till they were informed, who adhered to the *root and mother of the Catholick Church*, that is, who maintained the true Faith, or who were members of the *Catholick Church*, for if *Cyprian* had believed, that *Cornelius* and his faction, had been *the root and mother of the Catholick Church*, he would not have injoyned his meſſengers to ſuſpend their judgment, till they were informed by the Presbyters and Deacons: ſo it is evident, that *Cyprian* by *Root and Mother of the Catholick Church*, means the *Catholick Church it ſelf*, both in his 45. and 42. Epiſtle; and in the ſame ſenſe,

epiſt

epiſt. 43. and 44. he exhorts them to return to their *mother*, that is, to the unity of the Catholick Church.

The ſecond paſſage of *Cyprian* is found in his 55. Epiſtle, where he hath theſe words, *That the occaſion of Hereſies and Schiſmes in the Church is only this, that the Prieſt of God is not obeyed, and that it is not believed, that one Prieſt, as Judge in place of Chriſt for a time, is in the Church.* This place is much urged by *Pamelius*, in his Annotations upon the ſaid Epiſtle, to prove an *œcumenick* Biſhop.

But it is anſwered, *Cyprian* in this Letter or Epiſtle, is inveighing againſt thoſe, who had ſet up one *Fortunatus* (as we ſhewed before) Biſhop of *Carthage*, in oppoſition to himſelf: and his meaning is not, that there ſhould be *one Biſhop* in the *Catholick Church*, but only *one Biſhop* in a *particular Church*, or the *Church of Carthage*: becauſe two Biſhops, in one place, occaſions Schiſmes, and Hereſies, ſaith *Cyprian*: ſo its evident, that *Cyprian* is pleading his own cauſe, diſputing againſt thoſe who had ſet up a Schiſmatick Biſhop, in the Church of *Carthage*, in oppoſition to himſelf, and then went to *Rome*, and calumniated him to *Cornelius*: it had been impertinent in *Cyprian*, in this queſtion, to bring in mention of an *œcumenick Biſhop*; the whole diſpute of *Cyprian* conſiſts in theſe two Sylogiſmes, the firſt is, *who riſe up in oppoſition to their lawful Biſhop, will aſſuredly be puniſhed by God.*

But *thoſe men*, Fortunatus *and* Feliciſſimus, *riſe up againſt their lawful Biſhop.*

Ergo, *God will aſſuredly puniſh them.*

The ſecond Sylogiſme is this, *who are the occaſion of Hereſies and Schiſmes, will be puniſhed:*

But *who riſe againſt their lawful Biſhop, are the occaſion of Hereſies, and Schiſmes.*

Ergo, *&c.*

By

By which diſputations of *Cyprians*, it is evident, that by *one Biſhop* he doth not mean an *œcumenick Biſhop*, but any Biſhop of a particular charge; becauſe if by one Biſhop he had meaned, an *œcumenick Biſhop*, the minor of his firſt Sylogiſme is notoriouſly falſe: for, *Fortunatus* and *Feliciſſimus*, did not riſe up againſt an œcumenick Biſhop, but only againſt *Cyprian*, Biſhop of *Carthage*.

But *Pamelius* inſtances, firſt, that *Cyprian* cites ſeveral teſtimonies of Scripture, in this diſpute, which did quadrate only to the *high Prieſt* of the Jewes: And therefore, thoſe words of *Cyprian* are more fitly to be underſtood of an *œcumenick Biſhop*. But it is anſwered, *Pamelius* playes the Sophiſter three wayes: Firſt, it is falſe, that theſe paſſages cited by *Cyprian*, are only applyable to the *high Prieſt of the Jewes*; firſt, he cites thoſe words of *Moſes*, *Deutr.* 17. *what ever man, who out of Pride, ſhall not hearken to the Prieſt and Judge who ſhall be in thoſe dayes, that man ſhall die.* But that *Moſes* is not ſpeaking here of the *High Prieſt*, but of any Prieſt, a very child may perceive, who reads that Chapter of *Deuteronomie*, or the 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. verſes of it.

Secondly, *Pamelius* Sophiſticates, in omitting thoſe paſſages cited by *Cyprian*, which cannot be applyed to the High Prieſt onely: as that of *Matth.* 8. 4. *Go ſhew thy ſelf unto the Prieſts*, and that of *Luke*, 10. 16. *he that heareth you heareth me*, &c.

Thirdly, *Pamelius* Sophiſticates egregiouſly, in concluding *Cyprian* to mean in thoſe words, an œcumenick Biſhop, by reaſon of his citation of thoſe teſtimonies of *Scripture*: for *Cyprian* in his Epiſtle to *Rogatianus*, and in another Epiſtle to *Florentius*, cites all thoſe very places, which he cites in this 55. Epiſtle to *Cornelius*, to prove that none ſhould oppoſe their Biſhop: But *Pamelius* himſelf, in his Annotations upon both

both those Epistles, confesseth, that neither in the one nor the other, *Cyprian* speaks of an *œcumenick Bishop*: in the one, he speaks of *Rogatianus*, in the other, he speaks of himself, as he doth in this 55. Epistle.

Pamelius objects, Secondly, that *Cyprian* here speaks of *a Bishop who is Judge in place of Christ.* But it is answered, *Cyprian* in those words, means not an *œcumenick Bishop*, but any Bishop whatsoever, as is evident, by these following reasons: First, he gives Colleagues to that Bishop whom he affirmeth *to be Judge in place of Christ*, and that in the same Epistle, his words are, *no man after divine judgement, suffrages of the people, consent of his fellow Bishops, would make himself Judge, not now of his Bishop, but of God.*

Secondly, because *epist. 69.* to *Florentius*, *Cyprian* calls himself a *judge constitute by God for a time.*

Thirdly, it is no marvel, that *Cyprian* calls any Bishop, *judge in place of Christ*, since *Ignatius* in his Epistle to the *Trallians*, gives the same Epithet to *Deacons*: he exhorts the said *Trallians*, *to reverence their Deacons as Christ, whose place they hold.*

Pamelius objects, thirdly, that *Cyprian* affirms, that the cause of schisme and heresies is, that *one Bishop is not constitute in the Church*, and affirms that *Cyprian* by *one Bishop* ever means *œcumenick Bishop*, as appears by his *epist. 48.* to *Cornelius*, and by his Book *de unitate ecclesiæ*: But it is answered, that it is false, which *Pamelius* affirms, for in those places mentioned by him, there is no such thing to be found in *Cyprian*, that *by one Bishop he means an œcumenick Bishop.* Secondly, it is false which he affirms, that *Cyprian* in every place by *one Bishop*, means an œcumenick Bishop; for in his Epistle to *Pupianus*, he hath these very words which he hath in this 55. Epistle, *viz.* that the cause of Heresies and Schisms

is,

is, that *one Biſhop preſiding in the Church, is contemned by the proud preſumption of ſome:* and yet *Pamelius* himſelf, in his Annotations upon the place, confeſſeth, that *Cyprian by one Biſhop means any Biſhop whatſoever, and not an œcumenick Biſhop.*

Pamelius objects fourthly, that *Cyprian* in his 55. Epiſtle, cannot mean *himſelf alone*, becauſe he affirms, *if that one Biſhop were acknowledged, no man would move any thing againſt the Colledge of Prieſts*; becauſe it doth not follow, that they who move any thing againſt *Cyprian*, oppoſe all other Biſhops: But it is anſwered, *Cyprians* meaning is, that in oppoſing himſelf, *they oppoſed the Colledge of Biſhops which had ordained him* Biſhop of Carthage: as is evident likewayes, by the next following words, which we cited before, *viz. no man can make himſelf judge of his Biſhop, after the ſuffrages of the people, and the conſent of his fellow Biſhops:* whereby it is evident, that the meaning of *Cyprian* is, that who oppoſed him, oppoſed the Colledge of Biſhops, who had ordained him.

Fifthly, *Pamelius* objects, that *Cyprian* after thoſe words of *one Biſhop*, makes mention *de ſervo præpoſito, or a ſervant preferred*, or ſet over the reſt, and immediatly after he makes mention of *Peter*. But it is anſwered none, can underſtand wherein the force of this objection conſiſts; for *Cyprian* after he had affirmed, *that it was no marvel they had deſerted that one ſervant who was preferred to the reſt, ſince the Diſciples left Chriſt himſelf: and then our Saviour asked the Apoſtles, if they would alſo leave him?* then *Peter* (upon whom the Church was built by our Lord) *anſwered for them all, Lord, whether or to whom ſhall we go?* Whereas *Pamelius* urgeth, that by *ſervus præpoſitus* is meaned *Peter*, it can be no wayes gathered out of the words of *Cyprian*; his ſcope in thoſe words is only to ſhew, that it was no marvel that thoſe Schiſmaticks abandoned

him their Bishop, *who was that servant set over them, since Christs disciples abandoned him.* That *Peter* was only that *servus præpositus*, cannot be gathered out of the words of *Cyprian*: for, that the Church was built upon *Peter*, and that *Peter* answered in the name of the Church, it makes nothing for the supremacy of *Peter*, as we proved before by the testimony of *Cyprian* himself; who in his books *de unitate ecclesiæ* affirms, *whatever* Peter *was, the other Apostles were the same*, equal to him in dignity and power: However, that *building of the Church upon* Peter, hath nothing ado with that *servus præpositus* mentioned by *Cyprian*; for as we said, *Cyprian* means only *any Bishop*, and in particular himself by that *Servant.*

Horantius, loc. chathol. lib. 6. cap. 10. and *Harding*, disputing against *Jewel, art.* 4. brings another objection, that *Cyprian by one Bishop* means not himself, or any other particular Bishop, but œcumenick: their objection is founded upon the words of *Cyprian*, who after he had affirmed, *that the cause of Schismes was, that one Bishop was not acknowledged Judge in place of Christ in the Church*; he adds, *if according to divine precepts, the whole fraternity were obedient to the said Judge, no man would move any thing against the Colledge of Priests*; whence *Horantius* and *Harding* concludes, that by *whole fraternity Cyprian* means the *whole Church*, and by *one Bishop one visible head of that Church.*

But it is answered, that *Cyprian, by whole fraternity, means that multitude of which any particular Church is composed:* as in his 68. Epistle, writing to the Bishops of *Spain, he desires them not to rescind the ordination of* Sabinus, *whom they had placed in the Bishoprick of* Basilides, he affirms, that the said *Sabinus* was chosen, by the suffrages *of the whole fraternity:* But *Horantius* and *Harding* will not affirm, that *Cyprian* in this 68. Epistle, means *the universal Church, or church of* Rome *by whole fraternity*; since it is evident by the

the circumſtances, that he means *a particular Church, or that Congregation which choſed* Sabinus *for their Biſhop.* Likewayes, as we ſhewed before, the ſaid *Sabinus* was placed Biſhop, and maintained in his Biſhoprick over the belly of *Stephanus*, Biſhop of *Rome*; who deſired them to reſtore *Baſilides*; and the ſcope of this 68. Epiſtle writen in the Name of the Council of *Carthage*, to the Biſhops of *Spain* by *Cyprian*, is to maintain *Sabinus* in his Biſhoprick, notwithſtanding that *Stephanus* Biſhop of *Rome*, deſired them to reſcind the ordination of *Sabinus*, and to replace *Baſilides:* That *Cyprian* by *whole fraternity* means a particular Church, appears by innumerable Epiſtles of his, as *epiſt.* 47. in two ſeveral places, and 58. in two ſeveral places; likewayes, and 63. in which laſt place, he affirms, *when we are at Supper at our Banquet, we cannot convocate the common People, that we may celebrate the verity of the Sacrament, in preſence of the whole fraternity.* And thus we have ſhewed, with what admirable Sophiſtry, our adverſaries endeavour to wreſt this notable paſſage of *Cyprian*, *epiſt.* 55. in which we have been the more prolix, becauſe from thence, they bring all which they can pretend to be of any moment, to prove that *Cyprian* was for the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*: they alledge other teſtimonies, more pungent, but they ſhall be proved forged, in the following Chapters.

The third teſtimony brought from the words of *Cyprian*, is in the edition of *Pamelius*, *Epiſt.* 46. in which *Cornelius* writing to *Cyprian*, hath theſe words; *We are not ignorant that there is but one God, &c.* and a little after, *that there ſhould be one* Biſhop *in the* Catholick Church; from whence they conclude *an œcumenick Biſhop or the Biſhop of* Rome, *as ſucceſſor to* Peter *Head of the Church.* But it is anſwered, *Cornelius* in this Epiſtle, is informing *Cyprian*, that ſome Shiſmaticks (who had par-

tied that Novatian Bishop set up at *Rome* against *Cornelius*) desired to be re-admitted to his communion, confessing their error, that they had been seduced, and now they are convinced, that *Cornelius* was their true Bishop: amongst other of their confessions, they profess they were not ignorant, that there was but *one God*, *one Christ*, *one Holy Ghost*, *and that there should be but one Bishop in the Catholick Church*; by which it is evident, that by *Catholick Church* they mean any *particular Church*, and here they mean *the particular Church of* Rome; of which they acknowledge *Cornelius*, to be that *one Bishop*, and not that other *Novatian Bishop by whom they had been seduced, and whom they would acknowledge no more for their Bishop, since there could be but one true Bishop of that Church*, viz. *Cornelius himself*. That this is the meaning of *Cornelius*, in this Epistle, is further confirmed, in an Epistle of his to *Fabianus*, (mentioned by *Eusebius*, *Hist. lib. 6. cap.* 35.) in which he objects ignorance to one, who knew not, *that there should be but one Bishop in the Catholick Church*; Here he means *one Bishop in the particular Church of* Rome. For a little after, in that Epistle, he affirms, *in that same Catholick Church there were fourty six Presbyters, seven Deacons and seven sub-deacons*; but he could not affirm, that in the whole Catholick Church, there were only so many Presbyters, so many Deacons, and so many sub-deacons: whereby it is evident, that by *one Bishop in the Catholick Church*, *Cornelius*, means, there should be *but one Bishop in any particular Church*; which is so evident, that *Chrystopherson*, in his version of *Eusebius*, renders these words of *Cornelius*, his Epistle to *Fabian*, thus; *he was ignorant that there should be but one Bishop* (*in hac Ecclesia Catholica*) *in this Catholick Church*, viz. in this particular Church of *Rome*: neither is there any expression;

preſſion, more frequent in the writings of thoſe Ancients then to to call every particular Church, *the Catholick Church*, which obſerveth the purity of the Catholick Faith, or Church univerſal.

The fourth paſſage of *Cyprian*, is in his 40. Epiſtle, directed to the people of *Carthage*, *there is one God, one Chriſt, one Chair, one Church founded upon* Peter, *by Chriſts own mouth.* But it is anſwered, it ſhall be proved in the following Chapters, that thoſe laſt words are forged; the reſt have no difficulty at all: for by *one Chair* and *one Church*, *Cyprian* underſtands that there ſhould be but *one Biſhop in every particular Church*; as is evident both by the ſcope and words of the Epiſtle: the ſcope of the Epiſtle is, to complain upon ſome Schiſmaticks, who had made a defection from himſelf, and the Church of *Carthage*; where amongſt other reaſons, againſt their defection, this is one; *there is but one Chair, viz. there is but one Biſhop in the Church of* Carthage, Cyprian *himſelf*: and ſince none ought to be acknowledged *Biſhop but he*, they were Schiſmaticks in making a ſeparation from him. This reaſoning of *Cyprian*, had been moſt ridiculous, if by *one Chair* he had meaned an *œcumenick Biſhop*, viz. if he had reaſoned thus; *they are Schiſmaticks, who made a defection from their Biſhop* Cyprian; *becauſe there is but one œcumentick Biſhop.*

Secondly, that this is the meaning of *Cyprian*, appears by the following words, where *Cyprian* affirms, *they had made to themſelves another Altar*, intimating thereby, that there is but one Altar in the Church: whereby it is evident, that he ſpeaks not of the Church univerſal, but of a particular Church, ſince none will affirm, that there is but one Altar in the *Catholick Church*. Likewiſe in his 65. Epiſtle, pleading the cauſe of *Rogatianus*, he affirms,

firms, that they who make a defection from the Church, *make another Altar unto themselves* : but *Pamelius* himself, in his Annotations upon that Epistle, observes, that *Cyprian* in that place, is speaking only of particular Churches.

Thirdly, that by *one Chair* cannot be meaned *one Bishop of the Church universal*, is evident, because *Cathedra* or *Chair*, is not one in the whole Church, since there are many Chaires in it: as is affirmed by *Tertullian* in his prescriptions, *cap.* 36.

The last passage they object out of *Cyprian*, is from his Epistle to *Pompeius*, where he affirmeth, *no man can have God to his Father, who has not the Church to his Mother.* *Costerus* the Jesuit, *Apolog. part.* 3. objects this passage of *Cyprian*, to prove that *the Church of* Rome *is the mother Church*, and likewayes to prove *the Bishop of* Romes *supremacy.* But the impudence of *Costerus* is very great, for *Cyprian* in that whole Epistle, disputes with such vehemency, and bitterness against the Church and Bishop of *Rome*, that *Pamelius* wisheth *it had never been written:* and it shall be proved in the last Chapter of this Book, that the said Epistle of *Cyprian* to *Pompeius*, and others also of his Epistles of the same subject, are left out in some new Roman editions of *Cyprians* works. As for the words now alledged, *Costerus* miserably wrests them; for in them he is disputing against the Church of *Rome*, and in the very next words, he accuseth *Stephanus* Bishop of *Rome*, not only of *Error*, but also of *Obstinacy*: his dispute is this; *Those who are baptized by hereticks, ought to be re-baptized, because the Sanctification of baptisme, is only to be found in the* Church, (apud Christi sponsam solam) *who can beget and bring forth children unto God*: but they who are baptized by hereticks, *are not born in the* Church, *neither*

neither can they have God to their Father, who have not the Church for their Mother. Ergo, *they ought to be re-baptized.* And a little after he adds, *how comes it then, that the severe Obstinacie of our brother* Stephanus, (Bishop of *Rome*) *is come to such an hight?* he means, by that *excommunication of himself, and the Church of* Carthage, by *Stephanus*, and his harsh carriage. For, as *Cassander* relates, *consult. art.* 7. when *Cyprian* sent messengers to *Stephanus*, he not only refused them audience, but also inhibited the Clergy of *Rome*, to admit any of them to their houses.

By which passage of *Cyprian* with *Stephanus* it appears, with what ingenuity, they object the 67. Epistle of *Cyprian*, to prove, that he acknowledged the Supremacy of the said *Stephanus*: because in it, he writes to him (*say they*) *to depose* Marcianus *Bishop of* Arles *in* France. But it appears by the words of the Epistle, that *Cyprian* only exhorts *Stephanus, to admonish the Bishops of the* Province *to depose him*; *not to depose him, himself*: what was the opinion of *Cyprian* concerning the power of the Bishop of *Rome*, in *deposition*, and *restition* of Bishops? is sufficiently manifested, by his carriage in the cause of *Basilides*, and *Sabinus* mentioned a little before. For in his Epistle 68. he stoutly opposeth, the restitution of *Basilides*, and the deposition of *Sabinus*; notwithstanding, that *Stephanus* injoyned both the one and the other, to the Bishops of *Spain*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Objections from forged Authors answered, pretended to prove the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, *before the dayes of* Cyprian.

HItherto, they have endeavoured to prove the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, before the death of *Cyprian*, by wrested and misapplyed testimonies: that not serving the turn, they fall to forgery, and that of two kinds; first, they bring testimonies from *bastard*, and *supposititious*, *Authors*; Secondly, from true Authors, *corrupted by the Popes authority or otherwayes*: we will discourse of the first sort in this Chapter, of the second in the following.

In the first place, they pretend the *decretal Epistles* of several Bishops of *Rome*, who lived in that interval, and after, unto the beginning of the fourth Age. But it is answered, all those decretals are forged, attributed to Popes before the dayes of *Syrictus*, Bishop of *Rome*, who lived about *anno*, 380. the reasons follow.

First, *Dionysius Exiguus*, a diligent Compilator of all the decretals of Popes, in one volumne, begins this work with the decretals of the said *Syritius*, not mentioning the decretal Epistles of any Popes before him: whereby it evidently appears, that there was no such *decretalls*, in his time, or in the *sixth Century*, whereby also it is evident, that they have been forged since that time.

Secondly, those *decretalls* are mentioned by non of the Ancients most exact enquirers after antiquity; such as *Eusebius*, *Hieronymus*, *Gennadius*, and Pope *Damasus*, who lived himself in the time of *Hieronymus*, and to whom *Hieronymus* was Secretar, but all those Authors; made exact enquiry

enquiry, after the actions of Biſhops of *Rome*, before the Council of *Neice*: and yet not one of them, maketh mention of thoſe decretals, which are at leaſt thirty.

Thirdly, the ſtiles of men are almoſt as different, as their faces: but it appears to any Judicious Reader, that all thoſe *Epiſtles* were penned by one man, having the ſame ſtile, but they are attributed to *Biſhops of Rome*, of divers Ages, whereof the laſt lived three hundered year after the firſt.

Fourthly, the Latine Tongue, before the Council of *Neice*, was in great purity: and the Biſhops of *Rome* of thoſe dayes, known to be moſt powerful in it: but the ſtile of thoſe *decretals*, is moſt barbarous. *Turrianus* objects, (who wrote a defence of thoſe Epiſtles) that thoſe Biſhops of *Rome* uſed a humble ſtile, in imitation of *Paul*, who ſhunned *the words of humane wiſdom*. But it is anſwered, that although *Paul* did forbid affected eloquence, yet he did not preſcrive *ſoliciſmes*, and *barbarity*, which both are frequent in thoſe Epiſtles. And firſt, for *Soliciſmes*, *Enariſtus*, *epiſt.* 2. *Epiſcopi ſunt obediendi & non detrahendi*: *Teleſphorus* in his Epiſtle hath theſe words, *Patres omnes ſunt venerandi non inſidiandi*, ſuch like expreſſions are found every where. As for *barbariſmes*, you have everywhere, ſuch expreſſions as thoſe folowing, *Rigoroſus tortor, dependere obtemperantiam: agere indiſciplinate; jurgialiter ſtare; paternas doctrinas injuriare: cuncta charitative peragere.*

Fifthly, *Iſidorus Mercator*, who lived in the ſeventh Age, challenged by *Barronius*, *ad annum*, 336. *num.* 80. and 60. as a great forger of monuments of Antiquity: he lived in the 7. Age, at which time, there was great debate between the Greek and the Latin Church; the Greek Church, refuſing to acknowledge the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, albeit *Phocas*, in the beginning of that Age, had taken the title of *œcumenick Biſhop*, from *Cyriacus*, Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*,

and bestowed it upon *Bonifacius* Bishop of *Rome*; yet, notwithstanding, the Bishop of *Constantinople*, still keeped the stile of *æcumenick Bishop* and would not acknowledge the Bishop of *Rome*. The said *Isidorus Mercator*, as *Barronius* relates, forged several monuments of Antiquity, to prove the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*; and he is commonly thought to be the forger of those decretalls, for three reasons; first, (as we said) he is detected of several other forgeries; secondly, because it appears by their stile, they are all written by one man; thirdly, because the stile is barbarous, and exactly agreeing with the stile of that Age, in which *Isidorus* lived.

Sixthly, it is demonstrat those Epistles are forged, not only by the stile, but by the matter contained in them: It were prolix to mention all; we will only note some few, sufficiently demonstrating those decretals to be forged. First, some of them are directed to those who were dead long before; as that Epistle of *Clement*, to *James*, in which he writes to him of the death of *Peter* and *Paul*: but *James* was dead in the seventh year of *Nero*, as is testified by *Eusebius*, *Hegesippus*, and *Hieronymus*; but *Peter* and *Paul* died not till seven years after, *viz.* the fourteenth year of *Nero*. 2. *Anterius* in his decretal, makes mention of *Eusebius* Bishop *of Alexandria*, and *Felix* Bishop *of Ephesus*: but *Anterus* lived in the beginning of the third Century, almost a whole Age before them both. 3. *Fabianus* in his Epistle, makes mention of the coming of *Novatus* to *Italy*; but *Cyprian*, *lib.* 1. *epist.* 3. affirms, that *Fabianus* came to *Italy* in the time of *Cornelius*, who lived at another time. 4. *Marcellus* writes a threatning Letter to *Maxentius*, pressing him with the Authority of *Clement* Bishop of *Rome*: but *Maxentius* both a Pagan, and a Tyrant, cared nothing for *Clement* at all. 5. *Zephyrinus* in his Epistle to the *Egyptians*, affirms, that it was against the constitutions of Emperours, that *Clergy men should be called before the Judge Secular*: the same is affirmed by *Eu-*

sebius

sebius, in his Decretal to the same *Ægyptians*. But in those dayes, *viz.* In the third Century, the Emperours were all Pagans: and it is ridiculous to affirm, that they made such Edicts, in favour of Christians, who were cruel persecuters of the Christians *6.* Its known, that many ceremonies came by degrees in the Church, and that there were very few ceremonies in the Church, the time of those Bishops of *Rome:* but those decretal-Epistles, makes no mention of the grievous persecutions of the Church in those dayes, no not one of them; but on the contrary, makes mention of the Church as it were in pomp, making mention of all those ceremonies, as *holy vessels, of the habit of the Clergy, of the Mass*, of *Archbishops, Metropolitans, Patriarchs*, none of which things were in the Church in those dayes: those *Cannons*, comonly called *Apostolick*, mention indeed *Primats*: but albeit they contain many profitable things, yet many learned men among the Papists themselves, maintain, that they were not made by the *Apostles* but collected from Cannons of the Council of *Antioch*, and other posterior Councils: See *Salmasius*, and *Photius, Bibliothick, cap.* 113.

We might alledge several other reasons, to prove those Epistles forged, as their absurd interpetation of Scripture, some of them maintaining *community of wives*, &c. But those reasons are sufficient, since *Bellarmine*, and *Barronius* seems not to care much for them; since *Contius*, Professour at *Bruges*, maintains them to be forged; since *Æneas Silvius* (*epist.* 301. according to *Bellarmines* supputation, 288.) expresly affirms, that before the Council of *Niece*, there are no Monuments for the *Popes Supremacy*; which he would never have affirmed, if he had not believed those Epistles had been forged, which ingeminate everywhere, the *Supremacy of the* Bishop *of* Rome: and yet the said *Æneas Silvius*, was afterwards Pope himself, under the name of *Pius*

second. Whence we conclude, that those Epistles were unknown to the Ancients. And whereas *Turrianus* objects, that *Isidorus* mentioneth them; It is answered, he is charged for forging them. He objects, secondly, that *Ruffinus* turned those three Epistles of *Clement*; but it is answered, those Epistles of *Clement* are very old indeed, but they do not prove the Antiquity of the rest. The stile of these three Epistles of *Clement*, is different from the stile of those others: and although *Ruffinus*, turned them from Greek to Latine, it doth not prove, they are *Authentick*. He turned also his Books of *Recognitions*, which are esteemed *Apocryphal*, by *Gratianus*, *Bellarmine*, and other Doctors of the Church of *Rome*.

And this much of those decretal Epistles: they alledge testimonies from several other forged Authors, in that interval, to prove the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome* in that interval, as *Abdias Bishop of Babylon*, is cited by *Dorman* to prove the supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*: *Linus* is cited by *Coccius*, for the same reason; *Clement* by *Harding*. viz. *his books of recognition*: *Dyonisius Areopagita*, *de divinis nominibus*, is several times cited by *Coccius in Thesauro*, for the same end: but all these Authors, or those books now mentioned of those Authors, are rejected by *Bellarmine* or *Barronius*, or *Possevinus*, or *Cajetanus*, or *Grocinus*, or *Sixtus*, *Senensis* and other lights of the Church of *Rome*: and therefore, it is needless to insist upon the disproving them; we will only answer one passage falsly attributed to *Eusebius*, or to *Hieronymus*, in his additions to *Eusebius*, and it is this:

Bellarmine, to prove that the Bishop of *Rome* hath a *legislative power*, and *Posnan* also, *thes.* 131. alledge a passage of *Eusebius*, *viz. that lent fast of* 40 *dayes was instituted by Telesphorus Bishop of Rome*, who lived in the second Age, and this is his first instance: But it is answered, that *Scaliger*, in his edition of *Eusebius* demonstrats, those cannot be the words of *Eusebi-*

us;

us; because *lib. 5. cap.* 17. he expresly affirms, that *Montanus* the heretick was the first that prescribed *set fasts*. Secondly, because *cap.* 34. of the same Book, *Eusebius* affirms from *Irenæus*, that in the time of *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*, who lived after *Telesphorus*, that the *fast of lent* was not observed one way, some observing one day, some two, some more, *&c.*

Bellarmines second instance is, that the said *Eusebius* affirms, that the *mystery*, or *celebration of the Mystery of the resurrection of the Lords day*, was first ordained by *Pius* Bishop of *Rome*, and universally observed in the west. But it is answered, that *Eusebius*, *cap.* 22. of the said Book, expresly affirms the contrary, *viz.* that it was ordained, by the decrees of several Councels: neither was it ever generally observed, before the Council of *Neice*; whereby it is evident, that both the one and the other passage is fraudulently inserted, in the works of *Eusebius*, otherwayes *Eusebius* would contradict himself.

CHAP. XIV.

Of the corruptions of Cyprian.

THere is not a Father of them all, of whom they bragg more then of *Cyprian*, to prove the supremacy of the Bishop *Rome*; and yet, there is not a Father of them all, of which they have lesse reason to bragg, as we shewed before. *Barronius, tom.* 1. *pag.* 129. *Let one speak for all* (saith he) *in time more ancient, in learning more excellent, in honour of Martyrdom far exceeding the rest of the Fathers, viz. Cyprian*: and then he cites this following passages out of *Cyprian*, *de unitate ecclesiæ*, *cap.* 3. *To* Peter, *our Lord after his resurrection*, *saith*, feed my sheep; *and buildeth his Church upon him* (alone.)

2. *And*

2. *And although after his resurrection, he gave alike power to all, yet to manifest unity, he* constitute one Chair, *and disposed by his authority the source or fountain of the same,* beginning of one.

3. *The rest of the Apostles were, that* Peter *was; in equal fellowship of honour and power: but the beginning cometh of unity* (the primacy is given to *Peter*) *that the Church of Christ may be shewed to be one, and* (one Chair.)

4. *He that withstandeth and resisteth the Church,* (*he that* forsaketh *Peters* Chair, upon which the Church is built;) *doth he trust that he is in the Church?*

In these words observe, that all the sentences written within a parenthesis, are forged, and not to be found in the old Manuscripts of *Cyprian*, or in the old printed copies of *Cyprian*; the reason wherefore the said sentences are added to the words of *Cyprian* is evident, because they make *Cyprian* expresly dispute for the supremacy of *Peter*, but take them away, the supremacy of *Peter* is quite destroyed; as may appear to any who will read over these words, and omit those forged passages, writen within a parenthesis.

If ye demand how those passages came to be added to *Cyprians* text? It is answered, that *Pius fourth Bishop of* Rome, called *Manutius* the famous Printer to *Rome*, to reprint the Fathers; he appointed also four Cardinals, to see the work done, among the rest, *Cardinal* Barromæus had singular care of *Cyprian*: *Manutius* himself, in his preface of a certain Book to *Pius* fourth, declareth, that it was the purpose of the *Pope*, *to have them so corrected; that there should remain no spot, which might infect the minds of the simple, with the shew of false Doctrine*: How they corrected other Fathers, shall be declared in the following Books? how they corrected *Cyprian*, appears by those words we have now set down, which are marked with Parenthesis, which being added

added, perverts the whole meaning of *Cyprian*: neither were they content, by adding to *Cyprian*, to prevert his meaning: other paſſages of *Cyprian*, which could not be mended by additions, or be made to ſpeak for them, by inſerting ſentences, unleſs they made *Cyprian* ſpeak manifeſt contradictions; thoſe other paſſages (I ſay) they razed quite out of *Cyprian* in the ſaid Roman Edition of *Manutius*, *anno*, 1564. in which Edition, they razed out Eleven or Twelve entire Epiſtles, as 1. 2. 3. 15. 21. 22. 71. 73. 74. 75. 83. 84. 85. 86. It were too prolix to declare, for what reaſons they razed out all thoſe Epiſtles the ſum is, *all of them were no great friends to the ſupremacy of the Biſhop of* Rome, *nor to the Doctrine of the preſent Church of* Rome, *anent the perfection of the Scripture.* We will cite a paſſage or two, out of the 74. and 75. Epiſtle, which will evidently make known, wherefore they razed thoſe Epiſtles: ſurely there muſt be ſome great reaſon, ſince *Pamelius* himſelf wiſheth, *thoſe Epiſtles had never been written*: What the reaſon is, appears thus? The 74. Epiſtle was written to *Pompeius*, againſt the Epiſtle of *Stephanus*, in which ye have theſe words, *Stephanus Hæreticorum, cauſum contra chriſtianos & contra Eccleſiam Dei aſſerere conatur*; and a little after, *Reus in uno, videtur, reus in omnibus*: That is, Stephanus *Biſhop of* Rome, *defends the cauſe of hereticks againſt the* Church; *who is guilty in one thing, he ſeems to be guilty of all.* The 75. Epiſtle, was written by *Firmilianus* to *Cyprian*, in which ye have theſe words, *Non intelligit obfuſcari à ſe, &c.* that is, Stephanus *Biſhop of* Rome *underſtands not, that the truth of the chriſtian Rock is obfuſcated by him, and in a manner aboliſhed.* The words of which two Epiſtles, are very prejudicial to the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*: thoſe Epiſtles are every where filled with ſuch expreſſions, too prolix

lix to be answered here; but these we have mentioned, are sufficient to declare, what the opinion of *Cyprian* was, concerning the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, or of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. In the said 74. Epistle, in several places he calls the said *Stephanus ignorant, arrogant, &c. insolent, impertinent, &c.* in the 75. Epistle, *Stephanus* is called *wicked, insolent, a deserter and betrayer of the truth*: Likewayes, what a friend *Cyprian* was, to the Doctrine of the Modern Church of *Rome*? appears by the said 74. Epistle; where *tradition* without warrand of *Scripture*, is called by him *Vetustas Erroris, antiquity of Error*, and affirms, that *all is to be rejected for such, which is not found in Scripture: so it concern matters of Faith*: whereby it appears, that *Cyprian incurres the Anathema of the council of* Trent. And this we have shewed how they have corrupted *Cyprian*, as well in adding to him, to make him speak what he thought not; and when that would not serve the turn, except they made him speak contradictions, they therefore also cutted out his tongue: what reason they had so to do, we have given some instances; many such other might be given, but it would be prolix, and these are sufficient. Now let us hear, how they defend those *Impostures*, and first, for the razing out of those *Epistles*, *Gretserus* answers, *Pamelius restored them in his edition of Cyprian.* But it is replyed, that this is as much as to say, that by the testimony of *Pamelius*, Pope *Pius* Fourth, and those four *Cardinals*, whom he appointed to correct the works of *Cyprian*, *are notorius impostors*: It is a new sort of reasoning, that *they did no wrong, in razing out those Epistles of* Cyprian, *because* Pamelius *restored them.*

Secondly, they defend those *additions by an old coppy of the Abbey of Cambron*: 2. *By a coppy fetched out of* Bavaria; 3. *And by an other old coppy of* Cardinal Hosius; and so *Gretserus*

ſerus the *Jeſuit* defends the laſt three additions. But it is anſwered, that the firſt addition *upon him alone*, is the moſt important of all; intimating, that upon *Peter alone* the Church was built, which is the main *Baſis* of *the Supremacy of the Biſhop of* Rome: but *Gretſerus* the *Jeſuit*, who defends this corruption of *Cyprian*, doth not affirm, that thoſe words *upon him alone* are found in any of theſe three Copies, he only affirms, that the ſecond addition *one Chair*, and the third, *the Primacy is given to* Peter, are found in thoſe old Copies.

Secondly, it is replyed, that that Copy of *Cardinal Hoſius* is only mentioned, but it was never yet ſeen: If *Hoſius* had any ſuch Copy, how comes he left not ſuch a Monument of antiquity to Poſterity? As for the other two copies, of *Cambron* and *Bavaria*, it is a ridiculous buſineſs, to object their Authority, againſt the Authority, not only of all the printed Copies of *Cyprian*, before that of *Manutius*, but alſo againſt all the Manuſcripts of *Cyprian*, found in the moſt famous Bibliothicks of *Chriſtendom*, and the *Vatican* it ſelf: and whereas *Gretſerus* affirms, that perhaps the *Wicklephian Hereticks*, corrupted all thoſe Ancient Manuſcripts, it is a ridiculous objection: how could thoſe Hereticks get acceſs to the Libraries of all *Princes*, *Univerſities* and the *Popes* own Library, to corrupt the works of *Cyprian*, without being perceived? It is far more like, that the Monks of *Cambron* and *Bavaria*, corrupted thoſe two copies, (If the Jeſuits have not forged thoſe two copies alſo) ſince there are innumerable proofs and teſtimonies, (as ſhall be proved in the following Books,) Yea, and of *Barronius* himſelf; that the Monks of ſeveral *Monaſtries* have corrupted and forged innumerable paſſages of Antiquity, eſpecially in the ſeventh Age, when the conteſt was hot,

with the Grecians about the Supremacy. The truth is, it is believed, that there are no such Copies at all, as that of *Cambron* and *Bavaria*, and that those Cardinals, appointed by *Pius* fourth, to oversee the Edition of *Manutius*, added those words of themselves, which is very like for two reasons; First, because it is known, that the *Indices expurgatorii*, *have added sentences, and razed out sentences at their pleasure in many Antient Copies, without the pretext of any other Copy.* Secondly, their impudence was as great, in razing out of those twelve Epistles of *Cyprian*, as if they had added those four passages. And since they openly did the first, it is very probable, yea more then probable, they did the last.

We have shewed, how *Gretserus* defends the first three additions. The Fourth is, *he that forsaketh* Peters *Chair, upon which the Church is built*, it seems that either those three Copies of *Gretserus* hath not these words, or else if they have, *Pamelius* doth not much regard their Authority, who in his Edition of *Cyprian*, hath left them out. It is to be observed, that the second and third *Addition* are of no such moment, as the first, and this fourth, and the razing out of these twelve Epistles of *Cyprian*. *Gretserus* defends only the second and the third; the First he meddleth not with at all; to the Fourth *he answereth*, *that* Pamelius *hath left it out, and therefore it was not added fraudently*: But we answer, as we did before, that *Pamelius* in leaving out those words, *declares those four Cardinal Impostors*, who were appointed by *Pius* the fourth, to oversee the Edition of *Manutius*; whose Copy is followed in the reprinted works of *Cyprian* at *Rome*, *Paris*, *Antwerp*, &c.

And thus we have minuted, all which is of any moment alledged, *pro* and *con*, for the Supremacy of the Bishop of

of *Rome*, before the death of *Cyprian*: where we have proved, by the teſtimonies of *Ignatius*, *Dionyſius* and *Cyprian* himſelf, that *there was no Office in the Church, above that of a Biſhop, in that whole Interval*: *Bellarmine* braggs much, *that the ſucceſſion of the Biſhop of* Rome *to* Peter, *in the Monarchy of the Church, was an article of Faith in all Ages, ſince the dayes of the Apoſtles.* But ſince we find no monuments in that interval, next the Ages of the Apoſtles, that *there was any ſuch Article of Faith*, but on the contrary, ſince we have produced teſtimonies, and invincible ones, that there was no ſuch Article of Faith, it is evident, *that the ſaid ſucceſſion of the Biſhop of* Rome *to* Peter *in the Monarchy of the Church, is a meer cheat*: For if there had been any ſuch thing, the Churches of the Eaſt, and Weſt, in the times of *Victor*, and the Churches of *Africa*, in the times of *Stephanus*, would never have neglected the *excommunication of Victor* and *Stephanus*, and died unreconciled to the Church of *Rome*: Neither would the middle Church of *Rome*, have placed them in the Catalogue of *Saints* and *Martyres*, if it had been believed as an Article of Faith, *that the* Biſhop *of* Rome *ſucceeded to* Peter *Jure divino in the Monarchy of the Church*, as is believed now in the Modern Roman Church, *as an article of Faith neceſſar to Salvation.*

And thus we have concluded the firſt Part of *the grand Impoſtor*, and have proved by Teſtimonies of Antiquity, (notwithſtanding all the bragging of our Adverſaries, that all Antiquity is for them) That the Antients, Councills, and Fathers, believed neither *the Supremacy of* Peter, nor that *Peter* was *Biſhop of* Rome, nor that *the Biſhop of* Rome *ſucceded to him, in the Monarchy of the*

the Church; and consequently, did not believe any *necessar communion with the Church of* Rome: To prove which, they bring nothing from Antiquity of the first three Centuries, which is not *perverted*, *mutilated*, *falsly translated* or *forged*. In the Second Part shall be proved, they have as little shelter for their Tenets, from the death of *Cyprian*, 260. to 604. when *Bonifacius* the third was made œcumenick Bishop, by *Phocas*.

FINIS Partis primæ.

Errata of the PREFACE.

Page 9. line 17. *for* given *Phocas*, *read* given by *Phocas*, p. 10. l. 3. *for* hom. *r.* whom. p. 10. l. 29. *for* add there reaſons, *r.* add other reaſons. p. 13. l. 27. for *Stephanus*, r. *Adrianus*. p. 23. l. 32. *for* Du pleſis, *r.* Du pleſſis. p. 28. l. 20. *for* l. b. 2. *r.* lib. 1. p. 29. l. 27. *for* ſuppoſitious, *r.* ſuppoſititious. p. 36. l. 3. *for* related, *r.* refuted. p. 34. l. 7. *for* Teſtimonies of antiquity at all, *r.* Teſtimonies of antiquity of any moment.

Errata lib. 1.

Page 17. line 28. *for* antiquitated, *r.* antiquated. p. 22. l. 23. *for* lib. 4. *r.* part 2. lib. 2. p. 23. l. 32. *for* lib. 5. *r.* part 3. lib. 2. p. 23. l. 32. *for* Hom. 55. 5. *r.* Hom 5. 5. p. 36. l. 13. *for* lib. 3. *r.* part 2. lib. 1. p. 36. l. 15. *for* lib. 4. *r.* part 2. lib. 2. p. 36. l. 16 *for* lib. 5. *r.* part 3. lib. 2. p. 39. l. 17. *for* of *Peter*, *r.* to *Peter*. p. 40. l. 22. *for* confidence, *r.* confidents. p. 49. l. 7. *for* mundos, *r.* multos p. 55 l. 30. *for* colunas, *r.* columnas. p. 56. l. 17. *for* τιθησιν, *r.* τιθησιν. p. 70. l. 15. *for* but to whom alſo, *r.* but to whom: alſo. p. 77. l. 4. *for* Hilarius de vnctad. *r.* Hilarius de trinitat. p. 101. l. 21. *for* Paul 5. *r.* Paul 4.

Page 189. line 22. *for* were proved to be head, *r.* be called head. p. 192. l. 16. *for* Cyrullus, r. Cyrillus. p. 199. l. 8. *for* our adverſaries, *r.* whereas our adverſaries. p. 200. l. 16. *for* Apoſtolus, *r.* Apoſtolis. after page 171. Immediatly followeth, 187. which is a miſtake in the Preſs, nothing is wanting.

Errata lib. 2.

Page 8. l. 12. *for* lib 5. *r.* part 3. lib 1. p. 16. l. 5. *for* diſtinction, *r.* definition. p. 86. l. 2. *for* conſtitute one Chair, *r.* (conſtitute one Chair) p. 87. l. 22. *for* cauſum *r.* cauſam.